

Appendix

Apprenticeship Figures Offer Substantial Proof of Worth of Bridges-Randolph Apprenticeship Act of 1946—District of Columbia Leads Country in Ratio of Apprentices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, information has come to my attention which would indicate that there may be some effort in this Congress to amend or repeal the Apprenticeship Act of 1946, for the District of Columbia, authored by Senator STYLES BRIDGES and myself, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I do not know whether such information is authentic or not, or if it is, from whence an attack would come. But I do know that any effort to abolish Public Law 387 of the 79th Congress would be most ill-advised and would be detrimental to the development

of skilled labor in the District of Columbia.

As a rule the members of the State apprenticeship councils are among the most enlightened and responsible leaders from management and organized labor. They counsel together in the cooperative effort to provide at State and local levels a sound foundation for apprenticeship training. The Apprenticeship Council of the District of Columbia is no exception in this respect; it is an exception only in that it has placed the District of Columbia in first position among the 50 States, the District, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in the ratio of skilled labor apprentices to the general population.

In this regard, it is noteworthy that the District of Columbia, with virtually no industrial activity, has an apprenticeship ratio more than three times that of such large industrial States as Michigan and Illinois, neither of which has an apprenticeship council. Nor is this merely an accidental relationship. The crucial importance of an apprenticeship council in stimulating the increase of registered apprentices is revealed in a report published by the Wisconsin Industrial Commission this year.

In this report, the District of Colum-

bia, with 2,267 registered apprentices, leads the Nation with a ratio of 1 apprentice for 336.9 members of the general population. Among the next 4 States—Arizona, Nevada, Connecticut, and Hawaii—each has an apprenticeship law which has been in effect two decades or more, and among the top 21 States, all but one has such a law. The evidence is overwhelming, Mr. President, in support of the validity of our State apprenticeship laws.

At a time when our technology is placing increasingly heavy demands upon skilled labor, it would be most foolish and ill advised to begin nibbling away at one of the means by which the supply of skilled labor is maintained and increased. I hope such an effort will not be launched by this Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a table adopted from the Wisconsin Industrial Commission Report of 1961 ranking the several States in the ratio of apprentices to population and showing the date of enactment of State apprenticeship laws.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ratio of registered apprentices to population—Adopted from Wisconsin Industrial Commission Report of 1961

States and territories	Apprenticeship councils	Population (1960 census)	Apprentices Jan. 1, 1961	Ratio to population	States and territories	Apprenticeship councils	Population (1960 census)	Apprentices Jan. 1, 1961	Ratio to population
1. District of Columbia.....	(1946)	763,956	2,267	336.9	27. Massachusetts.....	(1938)	5,148,578	3,881	1,326.6
2. Arizona.....	(1941)	1,302,161	2,582	504.3	28. Tennessee.....	(None)	3,567,089	2,662	1,340.0
3. Nevada.....	(1939)	285,278	527	540.3	29. North Dakota.....	(None)	632,446	462	1,368.9
4. Connecticut.....	(1938)	2,535,234	4,358	581.7	30. Indiana.....	(None)	4,662,498	3,403	1,370.1
5. Hawaii.....	(1941)	632,772	1,054	600.3	31. Maryland.....	(None)	3,100,689	2,165	1,430.3
6. Washington.....	(1941)	2,853,214	4,064	702.0	32. New Jersey.....	(1953)	6,066,782	4,177	1,452.4
7. Rhode Island.....	(1942)	859,488	1,172	733.3	33. North Carolina.....	(1939)	4,556,155	3,105	1,467.3
8. California.....	(1939)	15,717,204	21,219	740.7	34. Louisiana.....	(1938)	3,257,022	2,096	1,506.2
9. Minnesota.....	(1931)	3,413,864	4,559	748.8	35. Oklahoma.....	(None)	2,328,284	1,521	1,503.7
10. Oregon.....	(1939)	1,768,687	2,345	760.0	36. Iowa.....	(1936)	2,757,537	1,783	1,546.5
11. Vermont.....	(1931)	389,881	513	760.0	37. Pennsylvania.....	(1939)	11,319,366	7,129	1,587.7
12. Alaska.....	(1946)	226,167	284	796.3	38. Maine.....	(1942)	966,265	606	1,599.4
13. Montana.....	(1941)	674,767	838	805.2	39. Nebraska.....	(None)	1,411,330	878	1,607.4
14. Utah.....	(1949)	890,627	1,094	814.1	40. Virginia.....	(1938)	3,966,949	2,467	1,608.0
15. Wyoming.....	(None)	330,066	378	873.1	41. Idaho.....	(None)	667,191	391	1,706.3
16. Colorado.....	(1937)	1,753,947	1,939	904.5	42. Texas.....	(None)	9,579,677	5,457	1,753.6
17. Wisconsin.....	(1911)	3,951,777	4,229	934.4	43. Georgia.....	(None)	3,943,116	2,196	1,795.5
18. Ohio.....	(1939)	9,706,397	9,808	989.6	44. Arkansas.....	(None)	1,786,272	943	1,894.2
19. Florida.....	(1938)	4,951,560	4,967	996.8	45. Kansas.....	(1941)	2,178,611	1,144	1,904.3
20. New Mexico.....	(1945)	951,023	935	1,017.1	46. South Dakota.....	(None)	680,514	356	1,911.5
21. New York.....	(1941)	16,782,304	16,331	1,027.6	47. Kentucky.....	(1940)	3,038,156	1,557	1,951.9
22. Michigan.....	(None)	7,823,194	7,366	1,062.0	48. Puerto Rico.....	(1947)	2,282,000	1,107	2,061.4
23. Delaware.....	(None)	446,292	417	1,070.2	49. Mississippi.....	(None)	2,178,141	1,003	2,171.6
24. Illinois.....	(None)	10,081,158	9,183	1,097.8	50. West Virginia.....	(None)	1,860,421	820	2,268.8
25. United States.....	(1937)	179,323,175	161,128	1,112.9	51. South Carolina.....	(None)	2,382,594	878	2,713.6
26. Alabama.....	(None)	3,266,740	1,978	1,145.9	52. New Hampshire.....	(1941)	606,921	210	2,890.1
26. Missouri.....	(None)	4,319,813	3,264	1,323.4					

The Peace Corps

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7500) to provide

for a Peace Corps to help the people of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the vote yesterday on the creation of a Peace Corps was one of those occasions when heart and mind conflict.

Many eloquent speakers, none more so than the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] for whom I have the highest regard, talked of the good will Americans would earn by sending young

men and women to live with and teach the people of underdeveloped nations. They pointed out that our massive foreign-aid programs have little effect upon the people in the villages of Asia and Africa.

Others spoke with equal conviction concerning the futility of sending a few hundred Americans to improve conditions among hundreds of millions in Asia and Africa. They spoke of how blunders would react against us. They predicted

the new agency would become another superbureaucracy and lose sight of its idealistic origins.

My heart is with those who believe that young Americans are both practical enough and idealistic enough to accomplish the objectives of the Peace Corps.

My experiences inform me of the dangers and pitfalls, and that we should not embark upon this kind of program as a permanent agency of Government until experience permits us to evaluate its operation and effectiveness.

We are getting such experience now. President Kennedy used authority under the Mutual Security Act to establish and finance a temporary program. Volunteers are being trained for service in Africa and Latin America. There appears no need to rush into establishment of the permanent Peace Corps agency.

I voted "no," not against the idea or the purpose of the Peace Corps, but to delay a decision until we know whether the experiment now underway is a success. I sincerely hope that it will be.

Why Is It Bad News When Khrushchev's Serfs Revolt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the Saturday Evening Post of September 16, 1961, is very timely:

WHY IS IT BAD NEWS WHEN KHRUSHCHEV'S SERFS REVOLT?

It is impossible to predict as this is written just what course the Berlin crisis will take. It is likely to drag along for many inconclusive months. However, Khrushchev's ability to retain the initiative, despite worsening conditions throughout the Red empire, undoubtedly received encouragement from a number of events in the West.

Even the President's military gestures could not have disturbed the Kremlin too much. The emphasis on conventional military and naval forces, coupled with our failure to order prompt resumption of nuclear tests could have led the Soviet dictator to believe that the West was not expecting serious trouble. He can hardly believe that the West is thinking in terms of limited war in which Khrushchev, with his superiority in numbers, would have the advantage. Talk of massive retaliation is not considered cricket these days. However, in 1959, when we had a Berlin crisis, President Eisenhower had only to ask the question: "With 175 Soviet divisions in that neighborhood, why would anybody dream of fighting a ground war?" Despite the President's remark that he didn't see how nuclear war would free anything, Khrushchev got the word. He didn't want nuclear war then any more than the Committee for a Sane Nuclear policy does. Nor does he today.

More disturbing have been the signs of funk over what should have been regarded as good news, the rush of refugees from East Berlin and the consequent disorders. Instead of general rejoicing over the appearance of cracks in the Communist wall, there were widespread expressions of alarm. Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the

Senate Foreign Relations Committee, suggested on a radio and television program that this country would be willing to "negotiate" the closing of escape avenues from East Berlin, presumably lest the flood of refugees create disturbances which could lead to war. The New York Times reported from Washington that "the policy of the United States and its allies continues to be that nothing will be done to encourage a rebellion in East Germany and nothing will be done to assist if one should erupt because of the danger of a clash with Soviet forces." In support of this policy, the Times stated editorially on August 16 that "we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our own principles, live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citadels of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

Certainly nobody demands military action in these circumstances, but the question arises: How long will our own citadel of freedom survive if the Kremlin is always to be free to shore up tottering Communist regimes with the tacit encouragement of the free world? Liberals, especially in England, console themselves with the thought that the flight of so many from East Berlin has served its purpose because world opinion is now convinced that people don't like communism. Well, that was made plain by earlier revolts in East Germany, Poland, and Hungary. Whatever would opinion may have learned from those tragic events, the Communists still control East Germany, Poland, and Hungary. Despite Vice President JOHNSON'S reassuring words in Berlin, the fact remains that Khrushchev had already bottled up the East Berlin escape hatch with no interference by the West. The danger to world opinion is that the bystanders will conclude that the West does not desire an end to the Communist threat earnestly enough to take any risks.

If we are going to shudder with fear every time internal discontents erupt into action in the Communist empire, and what is worse, if we actually are going to attempt to throttle the discontented to save our own skins, our eventual fate can be charted. That course would not save our skins but would hasten the day when, having lost our allies within the slave empire and weakened our own morale by false hopes and avoidances, we faced the ultimatum: Surrender or die.

Summer Commencement Address at Boston University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Dr. Harold C. Case, president of Boston University in a recent summer commencement address at the university asked that we look again for the meaning and spirit behind the values of true freedom.

In the face of crises, propaganda, and policy changes from the Soviet Union, he said, "We are running scared, instead of remaining poised." Yet freedom is made up of discipline, not whim, Dr. Case points out. Panic or hasty impro-

visation cannot substitute for steady research and development on the problems of making democracy work with integrity.

I feel Dr. Case's words are particularly valuable for us today at a time when the President, Congress, and the Government are under constant provocation from at home and abroad to do something about the problems being forced on us by Mr. Khrushchev and others. We must always remember the value of patience in times such as these. We must remain strong, but we must also be careful not to abuse this strength and use it hastily in the face of provocation.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Case's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1837, Ralph Waldo Emerson, speaking in a time of acute depression and of widespread confusion, counseled Harvard graduates "not to quit their belief that a popgun is a popgun, though the ancient and honorable of the earth affirm it to be the crack of doom."

Since we have a vocal group of doom peddlers in our time, we shall do well to heed Mr. Emerson's advice. It is difficult, at best, to maintain balance in a society swinging past the center, to the far extremes of right and of left. In fact, the favorite strategy of the Soviets is to change policy and propaganda frequently, to force their competitors off balance.

Poise invites reflection and tells us that the greater the volume of propaganda and the more extreme, the more clear the evidence of trouble in the realm of the propagandamaker.

So, the achievement of the Russian scientists in launching Titov into orbit, and his success in 17 circuits around the earth and a self-controlled landing, tempt us to frantic efforts through crash programs to catch up in the space race.

But when the print is barely dry on reports of this Russian exploit, they close the Brandenburg gate and string barbed wire, mount machineguns and fire tear gas, to seal off Germans who are unfortunate residents in the east side of Berlin from access to their jobs, relatives, or supplies on the fortunate west side of that city. Thus, communism is exposed before all the world—the emerging peoples and the sophisticated nations—as a failure in its attempt to win the loyalties of thoughtful people.

To be sure, tomorrow may produce a report of a Russian moon landing. But the next day will bring another haunting demand for freedom from oppression and forceful coercion. Meanwhile, we should maintain poise.

I speak today for the reinterpretation of the meaning and the re-animation of the values of true freedom.

The paramount goal of this Nation was stated at the outset of our history, as follows, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It was a great conviction. Its soaring hopes launched a new nation. The people bound themselves by the declaration that each person has infinite worth. What majestic progress has been made toward the realization of that high aim. Lofly living standards, a comprehensive educational system, an expanding economy, vital religion, decent communities, honorable citizens, loving families—much has been accomplished.

More, much more, remains to be done, in racial integration, improvement and expansion of education, extension of medical care, assurance of decent government, but enough has been achieved to make this Nation the envy, the dream, and often the resentment, of all other nations.

Shall we desert this utopian hope? When others wish for our living level, shall we deplete our energies, and deaden our idealism? Never, in the long trek from primitive existence to modern convenience, has any nation been given such an opportunity as ours.

I believe that one of the chief causes of our confusion at this time is that we do not understand or believe in our own tradition.

"Democracy," says Henry Wriston "is the political aspect of the assertion of the supreme importance of the individual. It is predicated upon the measureless riches that arise from the variety of his inventiveness. In freedom, each thinker and doer has the right to self-expression in vocation and avocation. Liberty puts the maximum upon self-discipline."

But the East-West struggle has assumed such proportions and has become so grim, that we are "running scared," demanding more fallout shelters, bigger bombs, and matching military forces. It would be foolish to deny that strength of arms is a likely deterrent to a dictator. But it would be equally short-sighted to hope that war, either of the "brush fire" size or of the nuclear-bomb extent, can substitute for intelligent negotiation. Nor will panic or hasty improvisation substitute for the steady pulse-beat of brilliant research and development. Our supreme task is to make democracy work with integrity, and to provide such resources for spirit, mind, and body for all of our citizens, plus cooperation with other nations for their good, that the stubborn faith of depressed peoples will sweep all tyrants of the right and of the left, out of power.

To this end, let us remember that freedom is not listlessness, but discipline. It is not made up of whim, but of keen thought. It is not designed to gratify one individual at the expense of another, but rather to provide each of us with the urge to inner control for the well-being of all.

The cultivation of inner directedness is, therefore, the central problem for the educational forces in a free society. Responsible thought and behavior are not cultivated by absence of rules or restraints, by hidden persuaders, by inflation of material wants, or by news emphasis on the violent or the tragic. Rather, it is attained when the mind and the emotions are disciplined and produce responsible action.

A man is not mere intellect. Some of the worst citizens have been brilliant. Man is not mere emotion. Feelings are never reliable, unless curbed by mind.

"The sense of responsibility from which self-control is to spring is rooted in a disciplined life of mind as well as of emotion, a balanced grasp of frequently conflicting values; it is rooted in a sensible, realistic picture of the nature of man," says Dr. Harry D. Gideonse. He summarizes Emerson's statement on man, saying, "man is not a professor, an engineer, a farmer, a garment worker. Man is whole. He is minister and scholar and statesman, and parent and lover and soldier."

Wholeness in man, if there is to be wholeness in conduct, is basic. Any drive toward increased productivity, toward applied science and technology, toward specialized, conveyor-belt production, is a sharper drive toward increasingly specialized use of only a small part of man's whole personal endowment. For man has a body and a mind, glands and a brain, and free man requires disciplined emotions and a disciplined mind.

Healthy feelings, trained imagination, the significance of rhythm, the value of tradition and richness of ceremony, the cultivation of skills in evaluation, are basic to the goals of each person.

Since the importance of specialized competence in science, in technology, and in administration is beyond debate, I suggest that our educational forces deliberately set about to enrich the social sciences and the humanities, the reflective and valuing experience, the arts in the curriculum and in the entire climate of learning.

In New England, we should know that while skills are important, they are not very reassuring. Textiles can change to electronics within one generation, and skilled men and women revert to unskilled laborers overnight.

Rather, we should think more and more of the total of the formative influences brought to bear on our youth. It is not radical to suggest that profit and loss may be excellent criteria of material productivity but questionable guides for cultural achievement, where quality alone is the proper standard. When, for example, profit controls the choice of programs in communications, violence becomes television's primary curriculum. Why we allow this, when we are expending so much for positive character values in the education of our children, I cannot understand.

I am trying to say to you that only if we are as effective in the achievement of the aims of our free society as the Soviets are in the achievement of the aims of a collectivist society, can we succeed. To this end, we must make stern self-discipline attractive, then recognize and reward it. We must cease to allow our cultural values to be muddled by a beatnik attitude, or made tired by the claptrap of political orations. Instead, they must be the springs of human behavior; each one of us must resolve to be a useful human being in a changing world, constantly probing, reading wisely, thinking deeply, evaluating idealistically, behaving wisely. We must again echo the words of an ancient writer, "now abideth faith, hope, and love, these three, and the greatest of these is love." In the Judeo-Christian ideal this is not a sickly, sweet, sentimental heart-throb, but the probing microscope of a scholar, the intelligent negotiation of a statesman, the cutting edge of a surgeon's knife, the wise decision of a judge, the affectionate discipline of a parent, or the demanding academic standard of a professor.

Let us be done with self-pity, with small talk, with jive language, with meaningless activity. We face a moral challenge, and we can meet it only by reemphasizing the moral, spiritual side of our nature and of our society. If we do this effectively, rigorously, and wisely, we can compete, we can balance our budgets, and we can reveal to the world the best way yet conceived for men to live together on this planet.

So, I urge you, not to lose your conviction that a problem is a problem, though the raucous and the reactionary proclaim it to be the crack of doom.

John E. Erickson, Retiring National Commander, Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I

am pleased to include an excellent and well deserved editorial in the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes, on September 14, 1961.

JOHN E. ERICKSON, RETIRING NATIONAL COMMANDER, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

To the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, as you and your auxiliary partner meet in Dallas, Tex., for your ninth annual convention, the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes extend to you greetings and best wishes for a successful convention.

With your national headquarters domiciled in the same building as the National Tribune, naturally we have had a close and pleasant association with your national officers and the affairs of your group. We have been eyewitnesses to most of their deliberations and have been impressed with the devotion, sincerity, and the dedication to duty with which they are instilled.

On the legislative front it seems to us that definite progress has been made. The appearance of your national commander and legislative representatives before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee was a signal success and brought forth many expressions of respect and admiration from Members of Congress. It appears fairly certain that the House committee will meet in executive session and give consideration to the pleas voiced by your representatives, although this may not take place before the present session of Congress adjourns.

From many, many communications received in this office, it appears that there is an admirable spirit of unity and harmony within the organization. The 11-point program sponsored by National Commander John E. Erickson has been well received at various department conventions held throughout the country and a large number of State organizations have endorsed it in its entirety.

Your national commander has been an able and eloquent advocate of the aims and objectives of the organization. He has been tireless in his devotion to his buddies. He has received splendid cooperation from those who were named to serve with him at Miami, Fla., last year.

With respect to membership in the organization, a new milestone was reached last month when the 200,000th member was recruited. There has been a significant increase in overall membership over the past year, new departments have been added and certified public accountants have attested to the financial stability of the organization.

We are well aware that no program can be fully completed within a year's time but it is a source of satisfaction to this newspaper and to your entire membership that much has been accomplished in the past year and a solid groundwork has been laid for future action.

As in the past, the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes will continue its active efforts to advance the program of your society because we believe in you and what you are endeavoring to do for your less fortunate buddies and their dependents.

May you continue to prosper.

"College News Conference"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I wish to be associated in the remarks made by several of my colleagues in welcoming

Ruth Hagy's "College News Conference" back to the national airwaves this fall.

The Peabody Award-winning program will begin its 10th year in late October over some 58 stations of the National Education Television and Radio Center network (NET), plus Metro Media, Inc., in New York and Washington.

Throughout the years, "College News Conference" has been an instrumental forum in acquainting, analyzing, and presenting to the American public the great issues and events of our time. The program has made an outstanding contribution in the field of public service broadcasting. Miss Hagy tells me that "College News Conference" is planning a new series format this year, and I for one am looking forward to the program's resumption.

In connection with the program's announcement, I ask unanimous consent that a press release from National Educational Television be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"College News Conference," the Peabody Award winning series, will begin its 10th year this fall on a new network, National Educational Television (NET).

Guests on the weekly series of half-hour programs during the 1961-62 season will include Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican of Arizona, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff, and USIA Director Edward R. Murrow. They and other distinguished persons will be interviewed by panels of selected college students.

The announcement that NET had acquired the series was made today—Wednesday August 23—by John F. White, president of the National Educational Television and Radio Center, headquarters and programing agency for the network of more than 50 noncommercial TV stations across the country. "College News Conference" formerly was presented by the American Broadcasting Co. In his statement Mr. White said "We are happy to welcome "College News Conference," a series with a distinguished history on commercial television. It joins a long list of other fine series that have established NET as a fourth national network offering outstanding news and cultural programs at prime time."

Ruth Hagy, producer and moderator of "College News Conference," said, "I have been delighted with the cooperation of National Educational Television and am very pleased to announce that NET will give us the opportunity to take our cameras to the people and events making the news. I have long felt that television should be doing more of this sort of thing."

The first program, to be seen on NET stations in November, will be a study of the Peace Corps in action in Colombia. Miss Hagy recently returned from a series of talks with Government officials in that nation. The program will include films of Corps members training in the United States, receiving on-the-job training in Colombia, and at work there, as well as interviews of Peace Corps members by outstanding Colombian students.

Donald S. Hillman, executive producer of public affairs programs for NET, said arrangements are being completed to produce a program in Berlin.

As part of the series' new format, "College News Conference" programs this year also will originate from cities throughout the United States. For example, the facilities

of the NET station in Denver, KRMA-TV, will be used for a program on space and development with space expert Gen. Bernard Schriever and students from the Denver area.

The program with Senator GOLDWATER may be shot at the Senator's home overlooking Phoenix by a remote crew from KAET, the NET station in that city.

According to Mr. White, NET also will make the series available, for broadcast by commercial stations on a sustaining basis.

"College News Conference" and Miss Hagy have been cited by numerous civic and youth organizations. The series has been on the air since 1952.

World's Best Place for Moon Rocketry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as progress is made in our country's efforts for the conquest of space, the time approaches when a decision must be made as to the situs of the launching of the moonshot.

The case thus far for my State of Alaska is ably expressed in an editorial appearing in the Anchorage Daily Times of September 13, 1961, and makes such interesting reading that I hereby submit same for the enjoyment and edification of my colleagues:

WORLD'S BEST PLACE FOR MOON ROCKETRY

A new range for launching space probes is being sought by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The search has extended to many odd and distant points but it is not believed to have yet been focused on Alaska.

Alaska should be considered. There are impressive physical, geographical, scientific, and strategic factors that make this State a logical area for serious attention.

NASA is trying to locate at Cape Canaveral, Fla. But even if ideals are compromised and huge sums of money are spent on facilities there, the outlook for future development, expansion, and utilization is bleak.

The new generation of space rockets will be different from the present ones. They will generate sound waves that will shatter windows at 20 or 30 miles. In Florida there is only a 10-mile buffer zone between the launching pads and dense population areas.

The main attractions of Cape Canaveral are that it is already an established scientific center, is accessible and reasonably close to supply sources and firings eastward are over water.

Alaska's attractions may overshadow those of Cape Canaveral and perhaps all other places under the American flag. They are certainly worthy of study.

Eight factors that distinguish Alaska are:

1. Land. Congress is being asked for \$60 million for the purchase of 80,000 acres in Florida, and condemnation proceedings may be involved. In Alaska there are dozens of places where NASA could have twice as much land at little or no cost, with assurance of more land for expansion as moon rocketry and new scientific developments evolve.

2. Separation. The Florida location has an inadequate separation from dense population centers. NASA will be faced with the continual liability for broken windows,

and perhaps the responsibility for clearing people from large areas—a costly and difficult program. In Alaska there need be no such problem. There are thousands of square miles of wilderness that would provide adequate buffer areas at no cost and involving inconvenience to no people.

3. Overwater shots. In Florida they must be made in one direction. From Alaska they can be made in any of several directions. By firing to the northeast, a rocket can go around the world without passing over a populated area. Boosters can fall into the water almost anywhere along the route. The only land area on the route is northern Alaska, northern Canada, and Antarctica. Another route for overwater shots could be to the southeast. The rockets could go 20,000 miles past the coast of continental United States, the tip of South America, Africa, and into the Bay of Bengal near India. The only land area on the route is Antarctica.

4. The Van Allen radiation belt. Scientists have discovered this hazard to space travel is at a minimum in the Arctic areas. Launching facilities in Alaska would take advantage of this.

5. Accessibility. Boosters manufactured on the U.S. west coast could be delivered by water, probably cheaper than by railroad across country to Florida. Ocean delivery would also solve the problems arising from the increasing size of rocket components. There would be no railroad tunnels too small, turns too sharp or other physical limitations on the route of delivery.

6. Climate. Booster rockets are known to function more effectively in cooler climates than in hot. Electronic components function more reliably in areas of even temperatures.

7. Tracking. Rockets launched from Alaska would take advantage of the tracking facilities and capabilities already available in connection with the DEW line across Canada, and the missile range of the South Atlantic Ocean. The rockets would pass near stations equipped for telemetering and with good communications tied in to Norad.

8. Strategic value. Facilities located in Alaska would be available for quick conversion to military use if the need should arise. Missiles launched here would have all major targets of both China and Russia within their range.

Business week magazine for September 2 said that NASA is trying to adapt Cape Canaveral areas to the big rockets after looking at many Pacific islands for better sites.

There was no indication that the space agency leaders had studied Alaska. Inasmuch as their decision will guide the expenditure of between \$2 and \$4 billion before the first lunar shot, it is essential that no area be overlooked.

Florida has some advantages but falls short in important categories. Alaska has attractions that might involve fewer compromises on the idea situation and installations would have longer use.

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately for the gentleman from New York, it was not possible for him to vote

on the Peace Corps legislation which passed the House on Thursday, September 14, due to the fact that I was asked to attend a meeting of Congressmen with President Kennedy late that afternoon.

I would have supported the legislation by voting in the affirmative had I been present, because I think the Peace Corps represents a true indication of the idealism of the American people and their eagerness to help those peoples of the underdeveloped countries abroad.

Some feel that the Peace Corps will not attain the objective or function with the effectiveness that is desired. On the other hand, the motivation supplied by President Kennedy, together with the eager and enthusiastic administrative support given by R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., leads me to believe that much good can be accomplished along the lines prescribed by the organizers of the Corps.

History has shown that great works can be done by dedicated missionaries of various types and there is reason to believe that even in the field of world affairs, much can be done if the aims are sound and the proper support is rendered.

The Peace Corps is a nonpartisan undertaking, and intelligent men from both sides of the aisle have given it their endorsement. The world will be watching the efforts of the men and women of the Corps, and from what I have observed they are a dedicated and patriotic group who will serve the interests of America well.

The Student Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Welcome, Stranger," published in the education section of Time magazine of September 8, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME, STRANGER

U.S. colleges this month turn to a duty that has grown to critical national importance: educating students from new and developing nations who passionately seek U.S. knowledge. It is a task full of promise. "Students want to come to the United States," says Philip H. Coombs, the State Department's Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. "This is an asset we should be pretty thankful for. We couldn't buy it."

Last year U.S. colleges enrolled 53,107 foreign students, up 46 percent since 1956. Included were 19,222 Asians, a 12-percent rise in 1 year, and 2,831 Africans, a 44-percent rise in 1 year. Last June U.S. colleges produced 20,000 foreign alumni, nearly twice as many as the graduates of all Ivy League colleges; 7.4 percent of Harvard students were foreigners. This year U.S. colleges will probably enroll at least 57,000. By one esti-

mate, the United States in 5 years may have 200,000 foreign students.

Foreign students are still only 1.3 percent of U.S. college enrollment (against 12 percent in British universities, 30 percent in Austria); yet the record far exceeds Russia's. The 39,500 students attracted to the United States from underdeveloped areas last year compared with 3,600 in all the Communist-bloc countries. Despite the lure of Moscow's Patrice Lumumba (formerly Friendship) University, the Russians hooked a mere 441 Africans, 186 of them from Guinea. The Russians' total Latin American catch: 200 students, half from Cuba. In the Middle East, they recruited 664 students mostly Iraqis. "Many Soviet scholarships are going begging in Africa and the Middle East," says Coombs.

MAKING FRIENDS

The U.S. Government itself is confined to a surprisingly small share of student exchange. Last year it provided only partial sponsorship for only about 5,000 foreign students. The rest are left to the kind of private effort that Coombs calls "the people's branch of foreign relations." He means that making U.S. friends out of foreign students is almost entirely a challenge to individual Americans, from the college president who selects sanely and sets up solid orientation to the family that feeds and houses foreign students with courtesy and discretion.

Unhappily for people dealing with foreign students, there is no stock model; Congolese differ from Kenyans as much as Belgians from Britons. But there is at least a statistical average. The foreign student in 1961 is probably a male undergraduate studying engineering (with social sciences favored among Africans). He is far poorer than his often rich predecessors, and he is culturally more remote from U.S. life. He needs more financial help, more guidance, and more understanding than ever.

One of his basic psychological problems is an almost invariable loss of self-esteem after arrival; he feels uprooted and hence resentful. He is shocked at the meagerness of his money; U.S. scholarships do not usually cover living expenses or summer vacations as do Europe's. He finds astonishingly diversified colleges with unpredictable standards. He finds rude waiters, Jimmy Hoffa, demanding children, and kind old ladies who ask Africans if they live in trees. He rarely finds anyone who knows the location of Mali, Gabon or Dahomey, or even of their existence.

UHURU

The more backward his country, the more elite the foreign student—and the greater his pique that no one recognizes it. "When you're dealing with an African student," says Coombs, "you may be dealing with a fellow who will be prime minister in 5 years." Yet if his skin is colored, the future prime minister is certain to encounter discrimination, not only in the South's segregated colleges, but also in northern restaurants, barbershops, and off-campus housing.

None of this weighs heavily against the promise of power and affluence that a degree guarantees. Education is synonymous with Uhuru (freedom). Kenyans deluge the United States with thousands of scholarship applications, some of them so misinformed that mature men have applied to a girls' boarding school. Says one British diplomat: "These people are going to get across the Atlantic by hook or by crook, and they are going to survive. They can't face their villages unless they return in triumph."

Until now, African students have mostly got to the United States on their own and with enough disorganization to damage their studies. Kenya's passion, for example, led to the pell-mell African airlift originated by

politician Tom Mboya that got so much publicity in the U.S. presidential campaign when the Kennedy Foundation beat the Eisenhower State Department to the punch with \$100,000 air fare. (Coombs used State's \$100,000 last spring to bail out the same 289 Africans flown in by the Kennedy Foundation; having arrived with sparse shillings and small scholarships, they were in dire straits.) A typical example was the Kenyan with a \$200 scholarship to a Midwestern university who learned that he also owed \$1,000 in fees, not to mention the support of his six children. Applying the self-help theory, which Tom Mboya favors, some students frantically begged for money everywhere. "Please help me," one wrote to the British Embassy, "because I'm beginning to smell."

DEODORANTS AND DISHES

In tidy contrast is a new program, developed by Harvard's Dean of Admissions David D. Henry, which this year will bring 250 students, mostly from West Africa, to some 150 U.S. campuses. Coordinated by the African-American Institute, the "Henry Program" includes a rigorous selection system, transportation, 4-year scholarships and all living expenses (paid by the International Cooperation Administration). A key feature is solid orientation. Many of the students recently spent 8 days on a transatlantic steamer, endlessly discussing everything from segregation to deodorants and the news (to Africans) that U.S. men sometimes have to wash dishes; one androcratic African man even sat down at a table next to a woman for the first time in his life. At Pennsylvania, Lincoln, and Atlanta universities, the newcomers soberly studied everything from dating to telephone terminology, even took model exams to get the feel of U.S. classrooms.

Secretary Coombs thinks that there is room for both Henry's and Mboya's methods. Coordinating the two approaches through the Institute of International Education, he has put another \$100,000 into a better screening and scholarship system in East Africa. But foreign-student aid is not fully organized and there is obvious need for a really extensive foreign-students admission system with State Department help all over the world. This is one of Coombs's top priorities should Congress approve a pending revision of the 15-year-old Fulbright Act that would unify and expand all U.S. exchange programs into what Senator FULBRIGHT calls "a positive instrument of foreign policy."

AMICABLE ALUMNI

Organization and funds will solve most of the quirks in student exchange, notably the money worries that help embitter visitors. But these problems do not seem to have cost the United States much prestige, to judge from the students who finish their schooling and go home. What they say, in fact, reflects singular credit on U.S. education.

Argentines admire college spirit and practical lab work in U.S. schools; their own universities have no campus life and few professors who answer questions. Middle Easterners thirst for the technical training that their own classical universities lack, and praise the pragmatic way of American life because it refuses to accept the status quo.

Of the 140 known U.S. alumni in Ghana, for example, the only West balter is Lincoln University alumnus (1939) President Kwame Nkrumah—although he may outweigh the others. More typical are such friendly U.S. alumni as India's Under Secretary for External Affairs, the director of the Iraqi Atomic Energy Commission, Colombia's Minister of Mines, and Venezuela's Minister of Finance. What seems significant is the Argentine pattern of students who leave for

the United States, as rabid anti-Yankees, return emphatically pro-United States.

"Everything I've done so far I owe to my American schooling," says the head of a major Turkish advertising agency who went to the University of Wisconsin. The story is familiar to Mandayam A. Sreedhar, 35, one of India's most brilliant engineers. What he learned at the Universities of Syracuse and Pennsylvania (1953) was warm belief in the "basic American view that two fellows can start a business in a garage and build it into a multimillion-dollar concern. I have never since found it difficult to understand an American."

Background Berlin, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial appearing in the Somerset Daily American on September 14, 1961. I believe this editorial to be timely because of the increased attention focused on the Berlin situation and thought the other Members of the House would like to have the benefit of the views in this editorial:

APOLOGY IN ORDER

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has advised former President Eisenhower that the State Department did not mean to criticize his role in the Second World War capture of Berlin.

A State Department pamphlet entitled "Background Berlin—1961" pictured General Eisenhower as having made the decision which prevented the Allied forces from taking Berlin before the Russians did.

The decision for the partition was made at Yalta in spite of the fact that General Eisenhower sent his chief of staff to Yalta to argue against the plan.

If we were to stop with the above statement, we might come to believe that Joseph Stalin was the architect of the division. If he was, he had a disciple on this side of the Atlantic who did his best to sell the bill of goods to the American people.

The same year that Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin met in Yalta (February 3-11) a book was published by Sumner Welles, who until the previous year had been Under Secretary of State. It was entitled "A Time for Decision" and in one part of it outlined a division of Germany which was the basis for the plan followed when the three heads of state met in Yalta.

The book was not the fly-by-night variety. It gives every evidence of extended research. The author backs his arguments with historical evidence. This means it must have been written before the Yalta meeting.

There can be no doubt about the influence which Mr. Welles had on those who partitioned Germany. It was not Russia but a united Germany which he felt would be a threat to the peace of the world in the years ahead.

To avoid this threat, Mr. Welles planned for a Germany which would be divided into three parts. His reason was to avoid the re-establishment of an all-powerful German general staff which could again plunge the world into another world war.

Another reason given for the division was the danger posed by those trained in the Hitler youth programs.

He did not believe that this group would

be ready for a democratic type of government. Here is the way he puts it: "There is no proof which can be offered, worthy of credence, that the history of the German people during the past 25 years holds even a spark of promise that democracy would become a true, or predominant, force within Germany so long as the tragically poisoned German youth of the Hitler years remain a majority of the German people."

If Sumner Welles could see West Germany today, he would be forced to admit that he was wrong. It is too bad that he did not realize that the predictions which he made concerning the future of Germany would apply only to the eastern sector.

This must be said, however, Mr. Welles did believe that the dangers which he attributed to the German general staff would thrive in a Communist-dominated regime. It was his hope that the United Nations would prevent Communist domination of East Germany.

The democracy which he predicted couldn't become a reality in Germany did come to pass, and with it came the union of two of the sectors which he wanted to keep as separate and distinct entities.

The third, however, has been a constant threat to the peace of the world. The reason is simply this: The Kremlin leaders are pressing for the kind of division which Sumner Welles outlined, with Berlin well within the boundary of East Germany.

"The Time for Decision" is a book which should be read by any who wish to understand the background of the present Berlin crisis. It is a more important book today than it was when it was first published 17 years ago.

Wisconsin Apprenticeship Program—A More Realistic Approach to Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a leader of the world—charged with great responsibilities—we also face a great need for a mature thinking and outlook in our domestic life.

Among other fields this is particularly true in the labor-management field.

In the past, the interests of labor and management have been too much considered antagonistic, rather than mutual. However, constructive efforts are underway to correct this attitude.

In Wisconsin, for example, mutual responsibility between employer and worker is the guiding principle of our statewide apprenticeship program.

Recently, the Green Bay Gazette published an article on this constructive effort to create a more realistic approach to labor-management relations.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRENTICE PROGRAM HAS RESPONSIBILITIES

(By John Lindop)

Mutual responsibility between employer and worker is the guiding principle of the statewide apprenticeship program.

Under the guardianship of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission, the program to train skilled workers in Green Bay is administered by the School of Vocational and Adult Education.

At the head of the nerve center of the area program, which works with some 100 business firms to provide them with carefully screened apprentices, is veteran Vocational School Administrator Glenn Fiedler.

LONG ON EXPERIENCE

A dedicated, energetic man who easily slips from the lingo of the shop to that of the educator, Fiedler has been with the Vocational School for nearly 40 years and is one of the prime developers of the apprenticeship program in this area.

The aims of the program, Fiedler explains, are twofold: "To assist in the development of better trained workers for the trades and to act as a protective measure for men entering the trades."

The apprentice relationship is based on a contract between the worker in training and his employer and is under the supervision of an advisory committee consisting of 12 men, 6 employers, and a like number of skilled workers in a particular trade.

GUIDED BY CONTRACT

The contract stipulates the length of apprenticeship, the pay the apprentice shall receive, his duties, and the type of training the employer is responsible for giving him.

Currently, there are 16 advisory committees in operation in Green Bay, representing a similar number of trades.

A prospective apprentice usually, but not always, will undergo 1 year of training before he is indentured to an employer.

He also will take a battery of aptitude and skill tests which takes into consideration everything from personality to ability before he is recommended to an employer.

LOW DROPOUT RATE

"Because of this careful screening our dropout rate is less than 1 percent," says Fiedler.

A prospective apprentice must first find an employer. He can either accomplish this through his own efforts or through the facilities of the vocational school.

Both the employer and the prospective worker are then called before an advisory committee.

The employer is then interviewed but at this point not told of his prospective apprentice's test results.

"We don't want the test results to be the only criteria upon which a man is hired," explains Fiedler.

Both the employer and worker are then interviewed and the committee then either approves or rejects an apprenticeship contract.

HOLDS VARIOUS JOBS

During the apprenticeship period the trainee can be shifted from shop to shop by mutual agreement of all parties concerned.

His starting pay rate will be about 50 percent of that of a journeyman's and will rise to 90 percent during the last 6 months of apprenticeship.

While normally during the past few years there have been some 300 apprentices working in the Green Bay area, this has dropped to only 97.

Fiedler explains the loss as a result of an economic slump which he claims has hit the entire State.

But Green Bay, he says with a confident smile "is still the bright spot in the whole statewide program."

SEES JOB SECURITY

To Fiedler the important thing about the program is that it will give the worker job security.

In Fiedler's words "after an apprentice has completed the program here he can work at his trade any place in the world."

In addition to the training an apprentice receives on the job, he also agrees to attend courses at the Vocational School.

As an example, in the tool and die trade the trainee agrees to attend 1 entire day of school every 2 weeks until he has accumulated 400 hours. He also agrees to attend school 1 night each week.

EMPLOYER ALSO GAINS

The program, however, is not a one-way street. The employer, too, gains an advantage.

One Green Bay firm, the Lindquist Machine & Tool Corp., of 314 South Pearl Street, has trained 13 apprentices.

Headed by two graduates of the area apprenticeship program, Roy Lindquist, 41, and Maurice Anderson, 43, the firm first opened its doors in 1946 as a one-man shop. Today the two partners employ some 50 persons.

Both men graduated from the area program in 1936.

Lindquist started the firm in September 1946, and Anderson joined him about 4 months later.

Lindquist says he would rather hire an apprentice with only 1 year of schooling than some experienced men.

"We know they are trained well and have good characters," the tool company head says.

CONFIDENCE IN TRAINEE

"We have confidence in a man who will put out the effort to go to school and learn his trade," says Lindquist.

A look at the firm's record shows that not one apprentice has been fired from the firm. Currently there are two in training.

Summing up, Lindquist points out "training is becoming of increased importance in the tool and die trade and through an apprentice program we know we can get skilled, reliable men."

Postmaster Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster John L. Sullivan, a beloved and highly valued citizen of Ridgefield, Conn., recently died with tragic suddenness. His loss was a great blow not only to his family but to his community and his large circle of friends. In tribute to him and in sympathy to his family, I respectfully submit the following editorial from the Ridgefield Press, which beautifully sums up the feelings of those who knew and admired Mr. Sullivan:

POSTMASTER SULLIVAN

The tragic death of our postmaster, John L. Sullivan, in the prime of life and at the peak of dedicated and able service to the people of his community has spread a pall of gloom over his native town.

Mr. Sullivan, member of a family which has made numerous contributions to our fair town in the past half-century or more, devoted his life to the postoffice, a service of no mean importance to every one of us. He did this quietly and efficiently with an occasional show of firmness which underscored his knowledge of his job and his understanding of its importance.

We join the community in sorrow for the loss of a fine fellow and we extend our sympathy to his loving wife and his children, to his good mother, and to the other members of his family.

Straight Talk to Russian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to all observers that the Soviet propaganda mill is deliberately and fantastically distorting the issues involved in the latest international crisis, not only in their statements directed for world consumption, but in what they give their own people. It is also apparent that we must get across our message to the people within the confines of the Soviet Union, despite the rigid censorship imposed over their news media.

Columnist David Lawrence, in a commentary that appeared Friday, September 8, 1961, in the Chicago Daily News, effectively pointed out the circumstances that face us, and made some very practical suggestions in coping with the problem.

I feel that these suggestions have a great deal of merit and are deserving of serious consideration. Under unanimous consent, I include this article entitled "Straight Talk to Russian People":

STRAIGHT TALK TO RUSSIAN PEOPLE

(By David Lawrence)

Everyone in America would back up almost any effort President Kennedy might make to avert another world war and to bring about a reduction in the current cost of peacetime armaments.

But, as so often happens when governments get bogged down in the rituals of diplomacy, the obvious is overlooked. Reliance is too often placed on strong talk to the Kremlin about bigger and better weapons or the mobilization of armies. But this doesn't reach the Russian people.

Today the most obvious fact staring the whole world in the face is that a dictatorship exists in the Soviet Union which lies to its own people by completely distorting and misrepresenting the viewpoint of the Western countries. This is not an academic matter for the Russians, either. For if war comes, millions of them will lose their lives.

Yet the U.S. Government is falling down badly in communicating its views to the people behind the Iron Curtain. The excuse usually offered is that it is hard to penetrate Communist-controlled areas and that radio broadcasts can be "jammed." This is partly true, but there are ways of reaching into the Soviet Union if a massive effort were made by the United States.

It seems incomprehensible that in a country like America, where publicity and advertising have reached such a high degree of effectiveness, the Government itself should be fumbling and bumbling in presenting its views to the world. President Kennedy has an alert mind, and he fully understands the art and value of publicity in domestic politics. It is a mystery why he has allowed the publicity of the U.S. Government abroad to be neglected.

It is not a question of which individual should manage the U.S. Information Agency or how much staff the Voice of America itself should have for its broadcasting operations. There is need for a vigorous and aggressive policy with a powerful directive from the President of the United States which would authorize direct appeals to the people of the Soviet Union. The bureaucrats may oppose it, but they are

not realistic in view of the threat that faces the world.

The existing directives, for instance, are based on a "pussyfoot" policy of forbearance. They provide that care should be taken not to seem to be dealing with internal affairs in Russia. So broadcasts are made in vague and abstract jargon, designed mostly to reach so-called "intellectuals." "Highbrow" lectures are offered to such an audience, when simple truths need to be stressed to publicize the current behavior of Nikita Khrushchev.

Today, when the world faces the possibility of a nuclear war, is not the time to handle America's viewpoint with tenderness or politeness. It is a time for straightforward and plain speaking by the American people to the Russian people.

The United States, moreover, need not hesitate to tell the Russian people that Nikita Khrushchev is threatening world peace, that he is suppressing the truth about his own nuclear tests, and is following a dangerous course which can lead to a war that neither side really wants.

Facts about the suppression of the truth and the enslavement of hundreds of millions of human beings behind the Iron Curtain—these are matters which need emphasis over the air waves everywhere. They must be repeated persistently, day in and day out, so that the whole world will have a basis for condemnation of real tyranny and real colonialism.

Nor is there any good reason to ignore the nonaligned or neutral nations either. Their peoples, too, should be told the truth. In many of these countries, which profess the virtues of their neutralism, censorship of the press and radio is maintained, so that the American viewpoint doesn't become known or is deliberately misrepresented. Many Americans are beginning to ask why billions of dollars of their tax funds are being given away in "foreign aid" to such nations while virtually nothing is being spent by America in those countries to give directly to the people themselves the truth about American policies.

A gigantic job of publicity is imperative. It will require not just the \$140 million which Congress has planned to appropriate for information services abroad, but at least \$1 billion. Congress would provide the funds quickly if there were a constructive policy and a comprehensive plan. This could, moreover, save the world from a costly war and make unnecessary some of the huge expenses being incurred by this country with its military budget of more than \$46 billion.

When will the administration stop overlooking the obvious? Time is running out. Officialdom has sidestepped the problem for the last 15 years. It is not a political or partisan question. It is a simple matter of directly telling the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc, in their own languages, that the West is truly interested in peace and that the Soviet leaders are playing with fire and can bring on a nuclear war.

Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled, "Can Automation Take Your Job?" carried in the September 2, 1961,

Issue of Family Weekly. I understand that something over 15 million persons probably read this excellent article relating to the problems of automation.

The article is by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, as told to Larston D. Farrar, and graphically points out the challenge facing the Nation's workers in the coming years—necessarily both a governmental and an individual challenge.

Mr. President, Secretary Goldberg has packed into the article a great deal of information about automation which can be helpful to the thinking of Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN AUTOMATION TAKE YOUR JOB?

(By Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Secretary of Labor as told to Larston Farrar)

As a nation, we are fond of catch phrases easier to remember than the facts underlying them. Automation is such a word. It's a phrase especially significant this Labor Day.

Two recent news items show why this phrase has become so important. One told of the opening of a new, fully automated mill, employing only three skilled men. These three—with a mass of machinery—will do the work which required hundreds of employees two or more decades ago. The other news item told of the abandonment of an entire steel mill, employing 1,500 persons, in Pennsylvania. The company announced that "technological developments" had made continued use of this plant "impractical and uneconomic."

Naturally, such stories prompt questions. Will automation and new techniques replace workers? Will they take away my job?

To find the long-range answer, we must look ahead—say, to 1970.

We find first that the expectation is for an increase of about 25 million in the population of the United States over the next 9 years—equivalent to adding a city the size of Chicago to the country about every 18 months. This expansion is expected to generate advanced demands for additional consumer goods, housing, highways, and considerable capital investment.

Second, we project about a 50-percent increase in the amount of goods and services we produce by 1970. This assumes, of course, that output per hour worked will continue to increase at the rate it has up to now.

These developments call for an additional 13 million jobs by 1970.

An important question is: What changes in our occupational structure will these 13 million additional jobs bring? And the question for you is—am I prepared for such changes?

One of the most impressive areas of growth is represented by the professional worker. If previous trends continue, our projections show that professional personnel may reach close to 8 million by 1965, accounting for a little more than 1 of every 10 workers. This is more than double the 1910 figure.

Taken together, the white-collar occupations actually have reached a historic position. This year they represent the single biggest group in the labor force, and they will be well ahead by 1965 and 1975.

Another important group which we expect will expand are the industrial workers at the craftsmen (skilled) and operative (semi-skilled) levels.

So you see, the job outlook for the trained man or woman is excellent. The job outlook in the service industries is also encouraging.

The crux of the question, then, is not whether automation will take away jobs, but whether the individual worker, white or blue collar, will be able to withstand the forces of change in the techniques or operations of his job.

Every working person should reexamine his qualifications for the future job market. He must ask himself if he has enough education and training to meet future demands.

A command of arithmetic, for example, is essential for the office worker, who may be called upon to master a new bookkeeping machine, or for the skilled worker, who may be put to work on a machine utilizing numerical controls.

High school students have a special need to prepare themselves well. A high school diploma today is an elementary requirement for entry into most jobs. Employers are seeking workers who have the potential to learn the new skills and techniques that are appearing every day in their businesses and factories.

No one is sure today where these swift technological changes are taking us. Both industry and labor are making efforts to train and retrain workers in these fields to meet the new job demands. It is obvious that the skilled worker with better education and training will be prepared best for the job opportunities and changes that are inevitably coming.

President Kennedy and his administration also are trying to find ways to help. In the past few months an Office of Automation and Manpower has been organized in the Department of Labor to find some of the answers.

Through the Office of Automation and Manpower, we are using three strategic approaches to the challenges of automation.

First, the development of an "early warning system," so that employees, union, and management can be alerted as far as possible in advance of technological changes.

Second, softening the impact of automation for hundreds of thousands of long-term unemployed workers through legislation based on the findings of our new Office.

Third, the retraining of those workers who still are able-bodied and capable of moving into other fields, where their skills may be in demand.

In the meantime, the President has proposed several legislative programs to help train the American worker for the new types of jobs which are, or will be, available.

At this juncture we are sure of one thing: The skilled worker must have flexibility, maneuverability, and adaptability. To have these three qualities he must improve his skills constantly.

All I have said amounts to this: Automation will not take your job away if you are properly prepared educationally, constantly alert to changes that are taking place in your field of work, and ready and willing to study and retrain for the new opportunities and jobs coming up.

An Era of Law Ended With Judge Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in our form of democratic government under our Constitution it is the duty of the court to determine what the law is, not what they would like for it to be. The following article by James E. Clayton in the

Washington Post of September 10 is very timely on this subject:

AN ERA OF LAW ENDED WITH JUDGE HAND

(By James E. Clayton, staff reporter)

When the teletypes clacked out the message on August 18 that Learned Hand was dead, they described him as one of America's most distinguished judges. They should have added another sentence: When Hand died, an era of American law ended.

The era to which Learned Hand belonged and which he personified as did no other American living in the seventh decade of this century was an era which was over, in large part, 25 years ago.

It was an era marked off from the rest of America's history by a unique group of judges. These judges—Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, Hughes, Sutherland, Stone, Hand—left a long imprint on history.

They were the men around whom turned the disputes of the twenties and thirties over the power of Congress. They were the men who laid out the arguments and the issues upon which debate still runs today—the proper role of the Supreme Court, the extent of congressional power over economic matters, the reach and content of the Bill of Rights.

But these were also men who gave America two great heritages. One is a heritage of judicial excellence to which many judges aspire but few attain. The other is a heritage of philosophy—not philosophy in the narrow sense of legal theories but a broad philosophy of the values Americans hold dear.

This imprint and these heritages began to be built at the turn of the century. It was 1902 when Oliver Wendell Holmes was appointed to the Supreme Court, 1909 when Learned Hand was named a Federal judge in New York and 1914 when Benjamin Cardozo first sat on New York's highest State court.

In the years that followed, Holmes was joined on the Supreme Court first by Charles Evans Hughes and then by Louis D. Brandeis, George Sutherland, Harlan Fiske Stone and Cardozo. Only Hand in this group never shared their title of Mr. Justice. But Hand won the title of 10th Justice because of the quality and quantity of his work on a circuit court of appeals.

What was it about this group of men that marked them off as framers of an era in American law and as major participants in American history? Perhaps more than anything else, it was their intellectual and cultural achievements, their deep and reflective thinking and their ability to express themselves precisely and yet eloquently.

These traits, which separate giants from mere men, appear from time to time on the American scene. But seldom has the Nation had such a group of men possessing them who devoted their efforts to one topic as this group did in the '20s and '30s.

The standards of excellence these men set will long remain with American law. They looked and acted like the wise men Americans expect their judges to be. Their dignity and decorum were above reproach. They were (and are) widely respected even by those who disagree violently with what they said and did. They brought to their task of judging that which Hand said a judge needs when he wrote:

"I venture to believe that it is as important to a judge called upon to pass on a question of constitutional law to have at least a bowing acquaintance with Acton and Maitland, with Thucydides, Gibbon, and Carlyle, with Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton, with Machiavelli, Montaigne, and Rabelais, with Plato, Bacon, Hume, and Kant, as with the books which have specifically been written on the subject."

Hand went on to explain why judges who interpret laws and rule on their constitutionality need this background. He said:

"For in such matters everything turns upon the spirit in which he approaches the questions before him. The words he must construe are empty vessels into which he can pour nearly anything he will. Men do not gather figs of thistles nor supply institutions from judges whose outlook is limited by parish or class.

"They must be aware that there are before them more than verbal problems; more than final solutions cast in generalizations of universal applicability. They must be aware of the changing social tensions in every society which make it an organism; which demand new schemata of adaptation; which will disrupt it, if rigidly confined."

This is not to say that all those who brought to the bench the wisdom and knowledge that Hand said judges need agreed on a basic philosophy or agreed on solutions to the problems of the Nation. There can be no sharper disagreements than those which arose between Sutherland and Brandeis or Sutherland and Stone.

But all these men had within their grasp that which Holmes once described as the joy of the thinker—knowing that "a hundred years after he is dead and forgotten, men who have never heard of him will be moving to the measure of his thought."

Take, for example, the question of how much power the Constitution gives Congress to regulate economic affairs. This was a crucial question in the twenties and thirties because on the answer to it turned social legislation of the 20th century. It was here that Sutherland and, to a lesser extent, Hughes parted company with Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, Stone, and Hand.

They fought the battle daily in the courts until it was settled in favor of broad congressional power. But the arguments and barrages which Holmes and Sutherland exchanged in the twenties provide the underpinning of today's discussion, which assumes that broad power exists but questions the wisdom of using it.

In the same manner, the arguments put forward by Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, Stone, and Hand are the basic statements used today when the meaning of the Bill of Rights is debated.

This issue now sharply divides the Supreme Court and many Americans. It turns on whether the guarantees of freedom of speech, press, religion, etc., are absolute bars against congressional power or whether they can be balanced against the need of the Nation for security.

The former position is that taken by Justice Hugo L. Black and the latter that of Justice Felix Frankfurter. Each man argues that his view reflects most accurately that of Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone.

Thus the influence of the men of the twenties and thirties invades the sixties and is likely to go into future decades.

The overlap, of course, is great. Frankfurter's influence was felt in the heyday of Hughes, Cardozo, and Stone. Hand's presence was felt when the day of Holmes and Brandeis was just beginning and it continued long after they were gone. But since the midthirties, only Frankfurter and Black, and perhaps Robert Jackson, have approached the standards of excellence and philosophy left by their predecessors.

Perhaps the best way to demonstrate those standards is to recall some of the philosophy of Hand, the last of the group. This philosophy, while close to that of Holmes in many respects and while joining that of Stone upon occasion, was not shared by all the others. But it serves to show how their minds probed deeply and well into the basic problems of mankind.

At the height of the McCarthy era, when suspicion was being cast upon many, it was Hand who said:

"Risk for risk, for myself I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust which accepts rumor and gossip in place of undismayed and untimidated inquiry.

"I believe that that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation without specification or backing takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists, to win or lose."

To Hand, the greatness of America was marked in its belief in liberty and moderation. The spirit of moderation, he once said, "is the temper which does not press a partisan advantage to its bitter end, which can understand and will respect the other side, which feels a unity between all citizens . . . which recognizes their common fate and their common aspirations—in a word, which has faith in the sacredness of the individual."

Of liberty, he said:

"What do we mean when we say that first of all we seek liberty? I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws, and upon courts. These are false hopes; believe me, these are false hopes.

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. While it lies there, it needs no constitution, no law, no courts to save it. . . .

"What then is the spirit of liberty? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

Not all the judges of the twenties and thirties would have agreed with all these thoughts, although most of them would have. But these are representative of the quality of thought and literature which that unique group of that era produced.

Those judges—Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, Hughes, Sutherland, Stone, Hand—were men who lived out their lives so that they met the test Hand outlined for all men when he spoke 9 years ago at a celebration of his 80th birthday:

"We can live without dishonor, and to live without dishonor is to live with a high heart and in such fashion that we shall not wince when we look back upon our part."

Suing for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article

from the Wall Street Journal of September 14, 1961:

SUING FOR PEACE

When President Kennedy met Premier Khrushchev in June, it could hardly be called a summit conference in the usual sense of a big-power bargaining session. As both men have indicated, it was little more than an attempt to size each other up. From the U.S. viewpoint, the meeting could certainly be justified on that basis.

Now, though, there is increasing talk of, and increasing pressure for, a summit presumably designed to resolve such dangerous questions as Berlin and the nuclear arms race. The leftist-inclined neutralists Sukarno of Indonesia and Keita of Mali have just been appealing to Mr. Kennedy to undertake such a meeting. Already speculation is rife as to whether Britain's Macmillan and France's De Gaulle would be included in any such session. The U.S. Government at the moment seems disinclined to be stampeded into the thing, but it has been pressured before.

Surely all this is way off base. To see why, it is necessary only to recall briefly just what we are up against. Khrushchev is trying to push the Western Allies out of Berlin. He has resumed nuclear tests partly to apply terrorism to that end, and partly out of what he considers his own military necessities. Negotiations are unlikely to deflect him from either course, for he has made it abundantly plain that he has no interest in real negotiations but only in extorting settlements on his terms.

Indeed, going through the motions of negotiation can serve Khrushchev's purposes, and is as intended; to the Soviets, negotiation is a means of waging the struggle, not of trying to end it. In the foreign ministers' conference on Berlin 2 years ago, the West finally did offer a series of concessions—not enough to satisfy Khrushchev, but enough to indicate the dangers of negotiations. And it is now clear how the latter stages of the test-ban talks were used to stall the West so that the Soviets could make their elaborate secret preparations for the current series of nuclear explosions.

Obviously, then, the United States should be wary of negotiations at any level, foreign ministers or summit or whatever. In addition, there is a further important consideration: This incessant talk in the West about negotiation, even about being the first to propose negotiation to the Kremlin, throws the whole picture out of kilter and tends to weaken the appearance of the Allied position.

It is one thing to be prepared to listen to anything Khrushchev may want to say, in the improbable event he should have anything to say worth hearing, and we can certainly do that without a summit; in today's circumstances a summit is about the last kind of conference anyone should be thinking about. But what is needed more than communication is more iron in the Western spine, iron that shows in our whole attitude rather than just displays of increased military power.

We have seen again, in the scared-rabbit reaction of the Belgrade conference of neutralists, how much headway we are making with world opinion. We have seen, over too many dismal years, just how useful it is to negotiate with the Soviets.

Khrushchev, after all, is the criminal of the world, not the West. Khrushchev is the potential murderer of peace. Khrushchev and Khrushchev alone hangs the pall of nuclear war over the globe. If the barbarian wants to sue for peace at the bar of civilization, let him do so. It is not befitting the strength of the Western position, it is not befitting the dignity of the defenders of civilization, to appeal to the outlaw to be good.

Blackwater Falls State Park of West Virginia Praised as Year-Round Vacation Retreat by Travel Editor of the Washington Star

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, now that we are moving toward the adjournment of a long and productive but sometimes tiring and tedious session of Congress, it would seem appropriate that I bring to the attention of my colleagues information regarding a relatively nearby resort in West Virginia where the tired body may be refreshed and lagging spirits may be restored.

In the September 10 issue of the Washington Star, there is a highly perceptive article by the travel editor, Jack Jonas, describing the facilities, the charm, and the natural scenic values of West Virginia's Blackwater Falls State Park.

As indicated in the article, Blackwater Falls offers excellent modern lodge and cabin accommodations, boating, swimming, hiking, and horseback riding in the summer and skating and skiing in the winter.

I commend the material to the attention of the Members of this forum and suggest that during the recess they take the occasion to visit one of the finest of West Virginia's State parks, and thus to return to the second session, in January 1962, revived in body and spirit.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETREAT IN WEST VIRGINIA

(By Jack Jonas)

The vacation world has been beating a path to the door of Blackwater Falls State Park.

Increasing interest in this year-round recreation area near Davis, W. Va., has, this fall at least, cut sharply into a popular package foliage tour out of Washington.

In falls past, Trailways Bus System has taken several busloads on week-end jaunts through the hills of Maryland, West Virginia, and Virginia, overnighing at Blackwater Lodge in the park.

But this year, because of advance reservations at the lodge, Trailways had had to limit its foliage weekends to one bus each, and there are standbys waiting hopefully for cancellations.

Key to its popularity is that it is a wilderness retreat with modern plumbing.

The 1,679-acre State park lies in the mountains of Tucker County, 4 miles from Davis, at elevations ranging from 2,500 to 3,400 feet.

Focal point of the scenic attractions is Blackwater Falls, from which the park takes its name. This spectacular steppingstone cataract drops 63 feet. For close viewing, there are steps leading down to the base of the falls.

AMBER, NOT BLACK

Blackwater River (the water, incidentally, is amber, not black) snakes through a rocky

gorge which is another scenic attraction of the area. At its deepest, it dips to 500 feet.

In winter, this has been a prime target for Washington area skiers. At Canaan Valley, 12 miles away, privately operated ski areas at Cabin Mountain and Weiss Knob offer such facilities as tow lifts, ski instruction, warming huts, ski rental, and snackbars.

Another winter sport is ice skating, usually possible on Pendleton Run Lake and on Mallow's Maple Lake. The winter sports season runs from December to March.

There is a large variety of summer activities, including a supervised program led by a recreation leader-naturalist and taking in guided hikes, illustrated lectures, movies, and square dancing.

Other summer activities include swimming in Pendleton Lake, boating with rowboats available for rent, also on Pendleton Lake, 5 miles of hiking trails, 3 miles of bridle trails, with horses available for rent, a picnic area on the north rim of Blackwater Canyon, and a variety of games in a court area near Pendleton Lake.

Trout fishing in Blackwater River is reputed to be good.

GOOD ACCOMMODATIONS

Overnight accommodations are excellent, but advance reservations are a virtual must.

Blackwater Lodge, located in the park at the south rim of the canyon, is as modern as a city hotel. It has 55 guest rooms, with rates ranging from \$7 for a single to \$15 for four persons in a room with two double beds. There is a dining room accommodating 250, a snackbar, gift shop, recreation rooms, and lounge.

Nearby are 25 cabins, also of modern decor and furnishings, and of varying sizes, accommodating 2, 4, 6, or 8 persons, with one-night rates at \$12, \$20, \$28, and \$36 respectively. After the first night, rates drop to \$5.50, \$7.50, \$9.50, and \$11.50.

The cabins are outfitted with cooking utensils, dinnerware, blankets, and linens. Heat is by forced air heater and stone fireplace.

Applications for reservations at Blackwater Lodge should be made directly to the lodge, and for advance cabin reservations, to Conservation Commission, Division of State Parks, State Office Building, Charleston 5, W. Va.

HOW TO GO

How to get to Blackwater Falls State Park: By auto: Try a circle route, going through Maryland and returning through West Virginia and Virginia. The route is north on Route 240 to Frederick; west on Route 40 to Keyser's Ridge; south on Route 219 to its junction with State Route 32; turn off at Davis, W. Va., for the park. On the return trip retrace Routes 32 and 219 to Route 50, and follow Route 50 east to Washington.

**Farm Legislation in the 1st Session,
87th Congress**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of our House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, for the excellent leadership he has given our committee during the discussion of the important legislative

matters which have come before us during this session of Congress.

The first important bill passed by Congress, which was reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, was the feed grains bill. This measure proposed a 1-year emergency program to reduce the production of feed grains in 1961, and thereby make it possible for the farmer eventually to receive more for his production, and to lower the holding of grains which now amounts to nearly \$4 billion. It is believed that this program will add around \$750 million in 1961 as compared with 1960 to the income of the producers of corn, grain sorghum, oats, barley, and soybean producers. In addition, it will relieve the Commodity Credit Corporation from assuming the storage costs of hundreds of millions of bushels of grain. This, of course, will result in a tremendous decrease in expense to the taxpayers. The major provisions of the 1961 feed grain program provided for payment in cash or in kind for retiring 20 percent of corn and grain sorghum acreage—or up to 20 acres, whichever is greater, on individual farms. Eligibility for price support for corn and grain sorghum was contingent upon participation in this diversion of 20 percent of acreage or 20 acres.

The second provision included payment in kind for retiring an additional 20 percent of corn and grain sorghum acreage. However, this additional acreage diversion would not be required as a condition for price support eligibility.

The third feature provided an increase in the price support level for corn from \$1.06 to \$1.20 a bushel, an increase in the supports for grain sorghums and other feed grains. It also provided for an increase in the support level of soybeans, intended to divert at least 2 million acres from corn and grain sorghums.

The next important piece of legislation reported by the Committee on Agriculture and passed by Congress was the Agricultural Act of 1961. This act instituted for 1962 a wheat program similar to the feed grain program, setting the 1962 wheat support at a national average of \$2 a bushel, or 83½ percent of parity. The feed grains program is extended for 1 year, 1962, with some minor changes. The act added certain commodities to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and extended the National Wool Act for 4 years to March 31, 1966. The omnibus agricultural bill liberalized agricultural credit, extended the school milk program for 5 years through June 30, 1967, extended the veterans and Armed Forces dairy programs for 3 years through December 31, 1964, and extended the Great Plains conservation program to December 31, 1971.

The Committee on Agriculture reported the sugar bill which extended the Sugar Act from March 31, 1961, to June 30, 1962. This bill was passed by Congress, and it is the committee's intention to give sugar legislation preferred treatment when Congress returns in January.

Other committee bills which were reported and which have become law are measures to provide a ceiling increase

for the Farmers Home Administration loans; to extend time for application of the 1959 amendment to the Federal Nematoicide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act; to amend title I of Public Law 480 and to provide \$2 billion additional authority during 1961. This is the law by means of which we trade our agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies. Congress passed laws, reported by our committee, which permitted the transfer of cotton acreage allotments from flooded areas, emergency hay harvesting on conservation reserve acreage in drought areas, emergency livestock loans extension, and surplus grain sales in disaster areas.

I wish to comment on three of my bills which have become law. The first of these measures was H.R. 1022, a bill to provide for the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments. The life of this bill is for 2 years, and it provides that both farmers involved in the lease and transfer of these tobacco acreage allotments must be in the same county, and the lease must be filed with, and approved by the county committee. If the normal yield of the farm to which the allotment is being transferred exceeds the normal yield of the farm from which the transfer is being made by more than 10 percent, the transferred allotment will be adjusted downward in the same ratio as the difference in yields. Not more than 5 acres of allotment may be leased and transferred to any farm. Only farms already having tobacco allotments for the same kind of tobacco are eligible to lease allotments. The acreage is considered as having been produced on the farm from which the allotment is transferred for purposes of future allotments and referendum voting rights.

The second bill is H.R. 1021, which extends for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and which permits the planting of peanuts for boiling purposes without coming under the provisions of acreage allotments. There are now about 3,500 acres of peanuts planted for this purpose, and we have a new industry being developed in Florida as a result of this legislation.

The third bill is H.R. 7694, a bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. Identical language to that in my bill was passed by Congress and we now hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will soon be able to institute a program which we hope will save our livestock producers approximately \$50 million a year which is now the estimated cost of this dreaded disease of cholera.

I am finishing 7 years of service on the House Committee on Agriculture, and I have enjoyed associating with my colleagues on this great committee. I sincerely believe that we have made tremendous progress in solving some of the agricultural problems of America. Let us remember that agriculture is still the greatest system of private enterprise that we have in America, and that as a result of the efficiency and productivity of the American farmer, we are far ahead of the Soviet Union in this important field of feeding our people and having enough food and fiber left to render tremendous assistance to our allies throughout the world.

Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was delighted to see in the Washington Evening Star of September 13, 1961, an article by Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army retired, which points out the need for firmness in our dealings with the Communists. General Clark is well known for his exploits during World War II and the Korean war and presently serves as president of the Military College of South Carolina, The Citadel, in Charleston, S.C. He speaks as one who has had many dealings with the Communists, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria, as deputy to the Secretary of State in London and Moscow in 1947, and at the Panmunjom negotiations. General Clark has served his country with distinction in these varied capacities and speaks with convincing authority. Our officials would do well to pay heed to these words of wisdom. I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing with Reds," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARK URGES FIRMNESS IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army (retired))
CHARLESTON, S.C., September 13.—My country has given me many opportunities to observe the Communists firsthand.

While I commanded the 5th Army in Italy during World War II, a group of Russian officer observers was attached to my staff. Their political adviser was Andrei Vishinsky, who organized Communist activities in areas that our forces liberated.

At the end of the war, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria for 2 years, I negotiated with Marshal I. S. Konev, the Soviet High Commissioner, who recently has been placed in command of the Soviet Armies in East Germany.

In 1947 I faced Communist negotiators across the conference table in London where I served as Deputy to the U.S. Secretary of State, and in the same capacity I sat in the Moscow Council of Foreign Ministers in 1947 with Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State.

Later on during the Korean conflict, when I was commander in chief, Far East and United Nations Commands, I came to grips with Communist tactics at Panmunjom during negotiations which led to the military armistice agreement for Korea which I finally signed on July 27, 1953.

USED SAME TACTICS

I found the Communists used the same obstructionist tactics everywhere I encountered them.

In Austria all communications lines from Vienna to the American zone were through corridors set up and controlled by the Russians and agreed to by the Allied Governments. The corridors passed through 110 miles of Russian occupied territory. There was one corridor by air, one by road, and one by rail.

The situation was identical to the present one in Berlin.

The air corridor was narrow between Vienna and our sector. Russian warplanes began crowding us inside this corridor. Sometimes they fired on our planes, and one, a Russian warplane, fired on the airplane in which I was flying. When I found protests to Marshal Konev to be futile, I ordered American planes flying the corridor to be armed and ordered our airmen to fire on any Russian plane that made a menacing move inside the corridor. I so informed Marshal Konev in writing. Never again did the Russians challenge us inside that corridor.

We had something of the same problem with trains. The Russians often halted our train, the Mozart Express, when it went through their zone between our headquarters in Vienna and our zone in Salzburg.

I followed the usual pattern of repeated protests to Marshal Konev, and, as usual, he took no action. Finally, he was warned formally that our military police had been ordered to keep Russian soldiers off our trains.

Shortly thereafter several Red army officers and enlisted men forced their way aboard the train. As a result, T. Sgt. Shirley B. Dixon, of our military police, shot one Russian officer dead and wounded another who tried to draw his gun.

The Russians violently protested the shooting, but the interruptions in our train service ceased.

These and many similar experiences I had with Communists around the world demonstrated to me the necessity of using unmistakable determination when dealing with representatives of the Kremlin.

An incident involving Danube River barges illustrates, however, that we did not always follow this policy. Shortly after our arrival in Austria, the Russians stopped all shipping on the Danube. About that time I found that all Austrian, Yugoslav-Hungarian, and other river barges had been moved up to Linz by the Germans in the closing days of the war. Therefore, they were in the American zone.

BOUNDARY EXTENDED

The Russians persuaded Washington to extend their boundary to the Danube in the Linz area; so I moved the barges farther up river to the American zone of Germany for safekeeping. I sensed that they would be an ace up our sleeve in bargaining with the Communists because barges would be essential when river traffic was resumed.

The Communists almost immediately pressured us to return the barges. On a trip back to Washington, I discussed the barges and gained the impression that everyone concerned, including President Truman, agreed that we should hold them. At a conference with me the President said, "Mark, I heartily agree with you. You hang on to those barges."

Upon my return to Vienna, however, I received a message from the State Department, instructing me to return the Yugoslav barges. I replied that I was under the distinct impression that I had approval for holding the barges as a bargaining point. The Secretary of State said to turn the barges over to the Yugoslavs. I turned them over.

MANY SIMILAR INCIDENTS

There have been many similar incidents in our dealings with the Communists. They demonstrate that strength and determination are two things Communists respect and, skillfully applied, will prevent communism from achieving its goal of world domination that today threatens free people everywhere.

Fortunately, there seems to be a refreshing awakening to this fact. This is indicated by strengthening our military posture, and by the firm stand that President Kennedy has taken on the Berlin issue. His reinforcing our Berlin garrison and his forthright statement concerning the consequences

of interfering with free Allied access to Berlin are the kinds of actions the Russians understand.

His sending Vice President JOHNSON and Gen. Lucius D. Clay to bolster the morale of the West Germans and demonstrate our vested interest in Berlin was also the kind of action that will not be lost on the Communists.

It is my hope that this approach signals that America has awakened, and that our country will pursue a courageous policy for firmness. Without such a policy we can never effectively negotiate with the Communists.

Marshal Konev once revealed their frustrating negotiating technique to me at a party in Vienna. After he had a couple of drinks of vodka, I asked him what would happen if the following morning I accepted all the preposterous Soviet demands then under discussion.

He laughed and said he would have 10 new ones to submit to me the next day.

In the face of such truculence, the free world must remain steadfast.

Let us have peace in our time, but not at the price of Communist slavery for ensuing generations.

Tribute to Representative Robert W. Hemphill, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a splendid editorial appearing in the Gaffney Ledger, of Gaffney, S.C., on Tuesday, September 12, 1961, entitled "Congressman HEMPHILL."

This editorial is a tribute to the distinguished Congressman, ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Representative of the Fifth District of South Carolina, for his active, able, and loyal service to the people of his own district and the rest of South Carolina in Washington.

It is my personal pleasure to bring this editorial to the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

To the tribute paid by this editorial I would like to add my praise of BOB HEMPHILL's outstanding representation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL

Congressman ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Representative of the Fifth South Carolina District, has informed friends in Washington he plans to seek reelection for fourth term next summer. That is good news.

Mr. HEMPHILL, who lives at Chester, has made the Fifth District, and the Nation a first-class Congressman. He is active and energetic in looking after the interests of his area and section but he is not provincial in his attitudes. He studies problems from a national viewpoint when that seems to be required, as in the case of textile imports. He is a genuine Democrat who bases his actions on a reasonable balance between liberalism and conservatism. This enables him to make South Carolina's Fifth District a topnotch Representative in Washington.

Some of Mr. HEMPHILL's friends sought to persuade him to run for Governor of South Carolina. That is a flattering suggestion, naturally, but Mr. HEMPHILL has come to the conclusion he can best serve his constituents in Washington. The Ledger concurs in that decision, and wishes Mr. HEMPHILL continued success in his present position.

Here We Go Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a firm believer in the ability and the right of State and local communities to meet problems within their jurisdiction, I feel that the editorial in the Wednesday, September 13, edition of the Chicago Tribune points out the effects of the administration's latest farm program manipulation. This editorial is a penetrating analysis of the situation, and I place it in the RECORD as an example of the great abuse by Secretary Freeman's Agriculture Department. The editorial is entitled "Here We Go Again."

HERE WE GO AGAIN

To conform with Federal Food and Drug Administration standards, the State department of agriculture has lowered the required minimum butterfat content of ice cream sold in Illinois from 12 to 10 percent, although there is nothing to prevent manufacturers from keeping the butterfat content higher than the minimum. In announcing the change, Ralph S. Bradley, State agriculture director, said he was clearly against it because it will result in an estimated additional 3 million pounds of butter on the already congested State market.

Mr. Bradley's concern about a butter surplus is commendable, for there is little doubt that a surplus of dairy products is building up again, reversing the downward trend of the last 2 years. However, Mr. Bradley, a Democrat who had a prominent role in President Kennedy's election campaign, should direct his protest not to the Food and Drug Administration, whose action will have a relatively negligible effect on the surplus, but to Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Milk production this year probably will rise more than 1 percent above the 122.9 billion pounds produced last year when there was certainly no shortage. In terms of milk equivalent, manufacturers' stocks of dairy products increased 2.4 billion pounds between January 1 and June 30, compared with an accumulation of 1.7 billion pounds in the same period a year ago. In addition to the sharp upturn in commercial inventories this year, Government purchases of dairy products under the price support program in the first 7 months have been equivalent to 5.3 billion pounds of milk, or 2.3 billion pounds above a year ago.

Volume of Government-owned stocks of surplus dairy products on July 31, not including those designated for sale or donation, was 29 percent above those of a year ago. On that date the surplus totaled 133 million pounds of butter, 34 million pounds of cheese, and 247 million pounds of nonfat dry milk. A year ago Government surplus stocks included only 34 million pounds of

butter, no cheese, and 287 million pounds of nonfat dry milk.

Government purchases of surplus dairy products declined after price supports were lowered in 1958, and it is more than coincidence that the upturn in the surplus in the last year accompanied three increases in price supports. The first occurred a year ago this month. At that time, Congress, with the forthcoming election in mind, enacted a bill boosting price supports on butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk, which President Eisenhower reluctantly signed into law.

This year Mr. Freeman has used his administrative powers to grant two additional price support increases on cheese and nonfat dry milk.

The present Federal program to support prices of manufacturing milk and cream has been in operation about 12 years. Net losses to the Government have amounted to well over \$1 billion. In addition, more than \$1 billion has been spent for dairy products used in foreign and domestic donations, transfers to the armed services and veterans' hospitals, and consumption under the special milk program for schools.

It is economic folly to raise price supports to levels that stimulate excessive production of commodities for which there is no real consumer demand at the higher price. Mr. Freeman could halt the surplus buildup by lowering supports, but he has demonstrated that taxpayers can expect no relief from him. Instead, they will be expected to provide many more millions of dollars to buy and store the surpluses, and then to dispose of them through subsidized sales and giveaway programs, so that the Kennedy administration can further its scheme to control the economic destiny of American agriculture.

Castro Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] has recently written a guest column for Mr. Holmes Alexander entitled "Castro Must Go." This column appeared in the September 11, 1961, issue of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., and a number of other newspapers across the country which carry Mr. Alexander's column. I am very much in accord with the viewpoint expressed in this column and have had a number of constituents write me commending this column to my attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO MUST GO

(Holmes Alexander has left on a brief European vacation. During his absence a number of prominent and interesting guests will contribute columns.)

(By Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Republican, of Texas)

The political columnist is a singularly influential force in American politics and none

is more forceful than Holmes Alexander. His invitation to be guest columnist is an opportunity no man in public life would turn down lightly. I accept with pleasure. If his regular readers will bear with me, I shall use this forum as a sounding board for some "Thinking out loud" on United States-Latin American relations; a subject which is at once most critical and absorbing.

The peak in a whole range of mountainous problems concerning our foreign policy in Latin America is the Castro government in Cuba. Anyone who does not recognize Castro for what he is—a Kremlin puppet—is gullible and naive. Having accepted that reality, the first order of business is to dispose of him and to reinstate freedom and self-determination for the Cuban people.

During the past few weeks I have discussed Castroism with many American citizens experienced in Cuban and Latin American affairs. These included businessmen, journalists, and government officials. I have received hundreds of letters from people all over the United States, and a surprising number from Mexico and South America, offering opinion and advice. I have heard Castroism analyzed by prominent citizens, officials and ex-officials of Latin America, including Cuba.

While some did not wholeheartedly endorse my position that the United States must take military action against Castro in co-operation with other Western Hemisphere nations if possible, but unilaterally if necessary, none had an alternate suggestion—but all agreed that Castro must go.

My studies convince me beyond any doubt that Cuba under Castro is a staging area for Communist imperialism in our hemisphere. The primary threat is against Latin America, but the overall threat is against all of us.

The military build-up in Cuba has now progressed to the point that any invasion of that island will be bloody and costly. But it will be infinitely more difficult within a matter of weeks. Six months hence, it will have to be a major military undertaking. A year from now Castro will have weapons and the capability of launching a major counter-attack against our southern cities.

In the meantime, Castro's police-state grip on the Cuban people is choking off both their means to resist and any potential uprising which might otherwise be counted on to aid invasion forces.

Clearly this is a time for action, not soothing words to the American people, not interminable negotiations in the United Nations or elsewhere, not further attempts to buy friends in Latin America—but quick, hard-hitting and decisive military action.

Attempts to strengthen Latin American ties are premature pending the disposition of Castro. Once that is done, we can move forward.

In my judgment political stability is the key to lasting freedom and resistance to communism in Latin America. This cannot be achieved while tolerating Castroism. It cannot be bought with dollars although dollars, wisely spent, can help.

The \$20 billion aid program presently being promulgated by the Kennedy administration may fool some of our own people into thinking that we are effectively fighting communism in Latin America, but I can assure you that it is not fooling Latin Americans.

Due to political instability in those countries, capital is fleeing Latin America at a faster rate than we are dumping it in. So long as this instability prevails, much of our money is going to support Socialist schemes, opportunistic regimes, and the established state of political unrest. It will drive out more capital. It will strengthen the very-rich, very-poor social structure which is the basis of political instability.

The achievement of such stability will not come quickly. It will be accomplished over a long period in hard but quiet bargaining sessions, with a maximum of persuasion and a minimum of bribery.

Once political stability is achieved, our money will help tremendously, and I will favor a carefully drawn aid program.

But first, Castro must go.

Statement of George J. Burger, Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Before House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, August 23, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on August 23, on the subject of H.R. 127.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, BEFORE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 23, 1961

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740-742 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

We are a national organization composed exclusively of individual, directly supporting, smaller, independent business and professional people. We are the largest business-professional organization in the country. As of August 11, 1961, we had a net membership of 170,194 (an 11,007 increase since January 1, 1961), and are continuing to grow in size and support.

Our members directly determine our stands on legislation, through their majority votes in polls we take among them in our publication the Mandate. We take such polls about once each month. In each poll we state the issue, and offer the strongest factual arguments on both sides of the question, ourselves remaining neutral, and permitting members to make up their own minds. Our members receive their Mandates through the mails, read them, and then vote and sign their ballots in the privacy of their homes and offices. We do not see or touch these ballots at any point. Members channel them to their Congressmen through their district chairmen, who are local federation members they select to head up each chapter. At the same time that chairmen forward the signed ballots to Congressmen, they report the overall results to us. The sum of tabulations received from chairmen in our more than 2,500 chapters across the country determines our stand. The methods used in our polls, requiring submission of actual signed ballots to Congressmen themselves, assures the validity of opinions stated. Verification of national summaries reported can be made by consulting the files of signed district chairmen reports we maintain at our headquarters in Burlingame.

Our members are found in all but a very few congressional districts throughout all 50 States. They are engaged in all vocations and at all levels of independent enterprise, ranging from operators of rabbitries and diaper services to doctors, lawyers, accountants, engineers, and local bankers. The size and distribution of our membership provide a basis for a true cross section of independent enterprise opinion and needs.

Speaking for our members, I want to thank you for your kind invitation to appear before your committee today to advise on the thinking of our members on H.R. 127 (I will touch on H.R. 1233 in a separate statement to be filed with you), which has been introduced into the Congress with the announced intention of strengthening the antitrust protections available to all in our Nation, including those in the independent business vocations.

In our Mandate No. 263, mailed to our members on February 2, 1961, we polled on H.R. 127 as follows:

H.R. 127: Curb "loss leader" abuses * * * Prohibit businessmen from selling goods below their costs when such sales promote monopoly and unfairly injure competitors.—(Representative PATMAN of Texas).

In line with our policy of remaining neutral in making these polls, and to assist our members in intelligently appraising the issues involved, we furnished our members the following comments pro and con on H.R. 127:

1. Argument for H.R. 127: Sponsors say this bill would eliminate the twin evils of loss-leader selling and cut-throat price competition which giant firms have used so viciously in driving small competitors into bankruptcy. It would operate the same as many State "antiloss-leader" laws do, by prohibiting any merchant from selling at prices which are below his buying costs plus a minimum markup to cover overhead. Also, the bill is expected to protect consumers from being victimized by misleading "bait-type, cut price" ads.

1. Argument against H.R. 127: There's real question if this bill would do any good. It must be enforced by Federal agencies whose effectiveness is questioned even by the bill's sponsors. Second, it involves more questions of accounting than there are drops of water in the seas. For instance, you'd have to pin down buying costs, item by item and firm by firm. You'd have to establish "overhead," which is another variable. Take a case to court under this bill, and the arguments could go on for years and years with no conclusion.

As reported in the Mandate No. 264, in thousands of votes cast, signed and mailed to their Congressmen, 70 percent of our members who exercised their ballot franchise called for enactment of H.R. 127, 27 percent opposed the legislation, and 3 percent registered no opinion either way.

Why did this vote run thus? Let's answer the question this way: To further improve our polling procedures for independents and their Congressmen, in December of 1960 we instituted a second surveying procedure that supplements the information derived from our the Mandate polls. We have been and are conducting this second surveying procedure through the attached "Independent Business and Professional Men" folder (sample, marked "A"). The purpose of this survey is to get a greater view in depth into the primary problem areas of independents, and a greater view in depth into the trend of thinking on these problem areas. Copies of this are mailed to each of our members immediately prior to a call by one of our field representatives, in his regular reports each year. This enables the member to collect his thoughts before the field representative calls, for possible discussion, and also in-

sure a reminder followup to get responses in.

We have distributed approximately 60,000 of these folders to members during the first half of 1961, and have received an approximate 65-percent response.

It is significant to note that in point of problem areas checked, that of unfair competition (co-ops, etc.) was checked about twice as frequently as the next most often mentioned area of difficulty. I attach a State-by-State breakdown of the actual responses to this poll (marked "B"). This will give each and every committee member a chance to study reaction not only nationally, but in his State as well. For your information, we have the actual signed ballots underlying this report on file at our California headquarters for your inspection, should you desire.

Along this line, a great number of our members who answered this poll took the time to write additional comments on their responses. Here is a representative cross section of some of the remarks made on the subject of "loss leaders":

General merchandise, Florida: "I have heard many complaints within the past 30 days that the loss leader was soon gone, and that the customers could not buy as advertised."

Camera shop, Illinois: "Big problem is loss leader selling at cost or below."

Meatdresser, Michigan: "Chainstores using dressed fryers for leaders, selling below cost, is killing our business."

Gasoline dealer, Minnesota: "Unfair chain operations re loss leaders, advertising, etc., is our big problem."

Business line not indicated, Missouri: "Need legislation to prevent loss leaders, but not to prevent genuine closeout of seasonal merchandise."

Flower shop, Montana: "Chainstores are using our items as loss leaders."

Music store, New York: "Unfair competition from discount houses, record clubs. Some of this starts at the manufacturer level, and results in use of loss leaders below anybody's cost."

Business line not identified, Ohio: "Our biggest headache is the discounters selling merchandise at practically cost as loss leaders. They take a well-advertised line and drag it through the mud so far as prices are concerned. When they have finished their dirty work, they take on another line and run it down. The legitimate merchant who is the backbone of American business cannot compete, and it will only be a matter of time before the manufacturers of these lines will find their profit squeezed to the vanishing point by demands of the discounters for still lower prices."

Food market, Pennsylvania: "Loss leaders are big problems with us."

Sporting goods, Utah: "Cutrate drug-stores that make leaders out of other dealers' regular line of merchandise are our main complaint."

Variety store, Washington: "Loss-leader items in supermarkets big problem with us."

Motor and implement dealer, Wisconsin: "State laws of retailing at not less than 5 percent above total cost should be enforced—manufacturer promotion of quantity sales at no profits to retailer should be curtailed."

Gentlemen, there are few better, truer, final teachers than experience, and believe me when I say that these independents who have made these remarks know what they're talking about. You can be sure that small businessmen generally practice economy, especially when answering polls. These independents did not write for the sheer pleasure of putting a pen on paper. I submit that their reaction in Mandate polls, plus their votes in the special poll, plus their direct remarks about loss leaders all add

up to a total that compels the following conclusions:

1. That "loss leader" practices do present a real and pressing problem of unfair competition, and

2. That whatever laws there are now on the books on this subject are inadequate, and that, therefore

3. There is need for immediate congressional enactment of this bill, or other measures, to correct this problem.

I would say, however, that the independent businessmen of this Nation are getting mighty sick and tired of the lip service that is being paid their cause in many quarters. They want action. Thus, if the Congress in its wisdom decides to enact this or similar legislation, as we fervently hope it will, then the Congress must follow through with all the means at its command and make sure that the Federal Trade Commission—which will be charged with enforcement—uses the laws to their fullest extent in making the needed corrections.

Why do I say this? First, because I know personally that a set of fair trade practice rules was drawn up about 1936 for the tire industry, and enforcement set with the Commission. These rules contained a clause prohibiting sales below the seller's cost where the effect was to promote monopoly. In the almost three decades since that time, despite the presence of cause for invoking these rules (including the prohibition against sales below the seller's cost), the Commission has never used them in any effective manner. Second, because shortly after the Supreme Court knocked out the Miller-Tydings Fair Trade Enabling Act, about 1950, Mr. George Frates, then Washington representative for the National Association of Retail Druggists, and I, representing the federation, conferred with a high official of the Commission and urged, as stopgap protection against unfair pricing, that the Commission enforce that part of the Clayton Act which permits action against sales below the seller's cost where the effect is to injure competition. We were told the Commission had never used this section of the act because it was considered, as I recall, unworkable.

Please understand, I am not being personal in these remarks as to any Commissioner or employee of the Commission, past or present. Over the years many fine men have held posts high and low in the agency. Many do today. But the fact is that over the years, through succeeding administrations, independents have heard many hope-inspiring declarations, have seen many encouraging starts, and growing accomplishment . . . but at the same time, and underneath it all, have witnessed a constant drag of delay, indecision, and confusion on many important matters, including that of action on sales below the seller's cost. Perhaps it is the system itself. Perhaps it is an attitude ingrained in the agency. Perhaps it is that the Congresses and the administrations have not wanted FTC to exploit its corrective powers to the full. I do not know exactly why. But I do know what has happened. And I do know that Congress has the key needed to unlock the solution to the problem.

Finally, our members were pleased to see the quick decisive action the President took on the Berlin situation, and to read how quickly the Congress mobilized to give him the tools needed to check communism abroad. But let's not forget that we're going to need a sound economy at home to support these programs. Let's not forget that we can't have this economy without flourishing small business opportunities and increasing numbers of small firms, to supply the production economically, to provide the payrolls and jobs and profits that produce the taxes.

Fair competition is the life of trade. Through this all segments of our economy are helped. Unfair competition, which

seems prevalent today more than ever in our economy—not alone existing in the distribution field but at the same time in the production field, if allowed to continue unchecked will end up in the complete ruination of independent business, and finally, the public at large will also be the victims.

The situation is serious and it's our hope the committee will report favorably on this bill.

Censorship of Communist Fighters— Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while the controversy raging around the continued muzzling of the military in an effort to prevent uniformed officers from engaging in educational campaigns exposing the excesses of communism grows increasingly heated throughout the country, we now learn of another Department of the Kennedy administration setting up its own censorship code.

Is it possible that the "better Red than dead" appeasers who have done so much to weaken British and European resistance to communism are gaining a foothold somewhere in our own Government in Washington?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some editorial comment from the press of Oregon which deal with the forced resignation of Forest Ranger Don Caron, a Federal employee who refused to be gagged or censored so courageously that he resigned his 15-year-old assignment with the Federal Government rather than repudiate his convictions and silence his actions against communism and the conspiratorial campaign it carries on here in America.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM FIGHTER RESIGNS FOREST SERVICE

An Okanogan professional forester who once was told he had "a bright future" with the Forest Service, resigned from the Service late last week rather than be muzzled in his fight against communism.

Don Caron, Conconully district ranger who has spent 15 years with the Forest Service in the Okanogan district, submitted his resignation after the Portland regional office, supported by the local administration of the Okanogan forest, directed him to discontinue writing educational articles against communism which appear weekly in the Okanogan Independent.

In being directed to stop his articles on communism, by Regional Forester J. Herbert Stone, Caron was told he was writing on a controversial matter that could cause "alienation of groups or individuals." The directive to Caron added: "The editorials reflect a zealous and almost fanatical patriotism, and an active effort to awake the public to the danger of communism. The opinions, views and attitudes expressed have much in common with those, as reported by the press, held by the currently controversial John Birch Society."

Caron, one of the founders of the Okanogan County Anti-Communist League, denied an affiliation with the John Birch Society, or using any of that group's material for his writing. He said he had been studying communism for 2 years, and uses material for his weekly discussion of communism from the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. "Other sources include the American Legion, the American Bar Association, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," Caron added.

Caron denied any violation of the Hatch Act forbidding political activities by Government employees, saying, "A recent decision by the Supreme Court has specifically placed communism outside the realm of politics."

His resignation, dated August 24, is effective September 1, and was tendered after his request for permission to continue writing his educational column was denied by the regional office.

One of the prime reasons given in denying Caron's request for permission to continue his column is the demand upon an employee's time by the forest service. "We do not feel you can do justice to both causes," the letter stated.

The denial was recommended by Okanogan Forest Supervisor F. J. Moisio because Caron's writings were controversial. His performance as district ranger was termed as "very good" by Moisio, who said the deposed ranger had not been doing his anti-Communist work on Government time "that I know of."

In his letter of resignation Caron stated: "I do feel that your decision is an infringement upon my rights as a citizen in that it will not allow me freedom of speech during my nonworking hours. The fact that I am a Government employee should in no way change my status as a full citizen."

CITIZEN PRINCIPLES

An Okanogan man pounded 15 years' public service down the drain and hammered the stopper over it last week—all because of principle and his devotion as a first-rate citizen of his country.

Elsewhere on this page is a story of the resignation of Don Caron from the Forest Service, a sad and deplorable ending to the years he has devoted to this work, all on the Okanogan Forest. He started with seasonal work at Chelan while going to college at a time when that area was included as a part of this forest, and since becoming a full-time professional forester, has continued on here in various capacities. Most recently he has been ranger on the Conconully district.

Caron resigned. He was not fired. Why then the tears?

Readers of the Okanogan Independent are aware that he had been contributing a weekly column to the paper discussing communism. This column has not been political in nature, but educational in concept, prepared from information by Government agencies, investigating committees of Congress, the FBI, and like groups. All of his background material is a matter of public record. But recently his superiors in the Forest Service sought to clamp a muzzle on Caron and a directive from the Portland regional office told him in effect to cease and desist his columns. Why?

A variety of reasons were given—all of which leak like a sieve—especially in the light of documented proof of the Communist threat to the United States.

First Caron was told he was in violation of the Hatch Act forbidding political activity by Federal employees. He was no such thing. Next he was told that the subject of communism is controversial and he shouldn't be mixed up in it.

The final reason given in asking him to stop his fight against communism was the demands which the Forest Service places upon its employees, and the fear that it might take too much of his time. This is preposterous nonsense aimed at a forester whose annual "report cards" have been highly complimentary of the devotion and skill with which he has handled his assignments.

What are the real reasons, then, for directing Caron to stop writing his articles? We wish we knew. It is difficult to think that Forest Service objectives for our country could differ greatly from those of any sincere and dedicated citizen. The esteem in which many hold the Forest Service may suffer because an employee is refused the right of free speech on his own time in performing a service to his country and its people, and reduce his status to less than that of a full citizen.

For 2 years Caron has been reading about, and studying communism. As an upshot of the knowledge he has gained, he was among many prominent people here who formed the Okanogan County Anti-Communist League. From this educational organization has grown many study groups of people who wish to learn more of the methods and evils of communism that they might more effectively fight this cancerous philosophy. We cannot think they are all ignorant peasants.

Caron is not asking for his job back. We are not asking that his resignation be refused. As his letter of resignation said, " . . . if the columns were stopped tomorrow for other reasons, my decision would be the same . . . they are only one phase of the total activity."

We wonder who pulled the strings.

KEEP IT HONEST

Repercussions are still being heard over the resignation of Don Caron from the Forest Service last week after he was refused permission to continue writing educational articles on communism for the Okanogan Independent.

Along with this, there has been a goodly amount of misinformation about the work Caron was doing, and at least one daily newspaper that comes into this area saw fit to slant its news story of his resignation to make Caron look bad. Is this good journalism?

To keep the record straight, this forester was not fired, nor was he requested to resign. He simply quit because he was denied the right of patriotism and free speech as guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States. For any news media to deliberately print erroneous information simply because a writer had differed in opinion with Caron and had his ears trimmed for it, is inexcusable.

To again set the record straight—Caron's articles were not in the form of a letter to the editor on a "controversial" subject. They have appeared on a regular, weekly basis for many months with only one object in mind—to educate people and give them the benefit of his 2-year study of communism.

The Forest Service instructed Caron to stop writing his articles because they were controversial. Since when has patriotism and dedication to God and country become controversial?

With whom is it controversial? It has been said that you should judge a man by his enemies.

This is certainly intended as no mass indictment of Forest Service people, but a few in high places should have provided better answers than they have come up with so far. A. E. Spaulding, deputy regional forester who signed the letter denying Caron's request to continue writing, has not spoken the truth, if Associated Press has quoted him correctly.

In a September 1 dispatch with a Portland date line, AP quotes Spaulding thusly: "The Forest Service in a letter to Caron asked him to consider not writing on controversial issues . . ." Spaulding's letter to Caron of August 21 said: " . . . your request is disapproved."

The same AP story quoted Spaulding as saying: "I can't say yet why he resigned." Yet, this officer announced Caron's resignation on August 31 after it had been written to him in a letter dated August 24.

If the Forest Service higher-ups feel they have done the right thing, then why tell half-truths about it?

It takes a big man to admit he was wrong.

Neutral's Stand Perils Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously pointed out, I feel that it is time we paused to ponder some of the recent actions of the so-called neutral nations who have been benefiting from our financial generosity.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor of the Hearst newspapers, has very appropriately described the situation in a recent editor's report entitled "Neutral's Stand Perils Peace."

The editorial is very timely. I hope my colleagues will read it. It follows:

NEUTRAL'S STAND PERILS PEACE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

What with the cold war world series getting hotter by the day, isn't it about time we took a closer look behind the masks of some of the self-appointed "umps" who call themselves "neutrals?"

No question about it, these would-be arbiters have been making some strange calls—most of them impartial against the United States.

Any time "Lefty" Khrushchev curves a low one 'way outside, they call it a strike. And no matter how fair our side hits it, these "neutrals" call it foul.

That's pretty rankling to Americans when we recall that most of these "neutrals" have been or are being rescued from economic misery by Uncle Sam—and with no strings attached.

I think a good rule for future foreign aid would be that neutral is as neutral does. A really neutral nation is the Swiss variety—it sticks to the meaning of the label and minds its own business.

There has long been sentiment in Congress for restraining our compulsive largesse toward foreign regimes which show their gratitude by habitually kicking Uncle Sam in the pants. Rumbblings from the White House indicate parallel thinking there.

Naturally it would be better for the world if all nations were to recognize that the Communist Empire respects no neutrality and violates it whenever that course is useful to Moscow and/or Peking. However, it is not altogether practical to fault weak and fearful nations for trying to stay out of a fight even though their course is shortsighted.

But that certainly does not go for such as Tito of Yugoslavia, Nkrumah of Ghana, Toure of Guinea or lesser fry who did their commie best to steer the just-closed Bel-

grade Conference of neutral nations into anti-U.S. positions. It got so bad that India's Nehru and Egypt's Nasser found themselves forced to shy away from the bad company they were in.

I am inclined to go along with those who believe that the Belgrade circus cost Tito a lot of influence among nonaligned nations and added some stature to Nehru.

After all, peace is the name of the game for a sincere neutral, and support of the Soviet collision course on Berlin is bound to work against peace, not for it.

For the record, let's review U.S. aid toward a couple of the most arrantly anti-American neutrals—Tito and Nkrumah. Ed Edstrom of Hearst Headline Service's Washington Bureau reports:

Aid to Tito's Yugoslavia since 1950—\$2.2 billions of which \$693 million has been military aid.

Aid to Nkrumah's Ghana—\$6.6 millions since 1956, all economic, largely in the form of food.

U.S. aid has boomed Yugoslavia's economy and greatly bolstered Ghana's. Both countries have had their hands out for bounty from the Red side, too, but Soviet aid is harder to pinpoint, being mostly in barter or project-building that can bear big "Made in U.S.S.R." tags.

As a force in the world struggle, the "neutral" nations sold themselves short at Belgrade. They had a big chance when the Soviet chose their meeting time as the occasion to resume nuclear testing.

But just deploring nuclear tests without condemning the Soviet action was meaningless.

The same goes for resolutions against colonialism which failed to mention the Soviet as the biggest colonial power of our time.

However well-meaning Nehru was in carrying the "neutral" peace plea to the Kremlin, all he has gotten is the back of Khrushchev's hand. Perhaps President Kennedy can be more polite to Indonesia's Sukarno and Mali's Keita, who arrive Tuesday on a similar errand, but at least he can tell them they've come to the wrong address.

It is not the United States that now or ever has threatened to break the peace.

In any case, it wouldn't be a bad idea to let them know that anti-United States "neutrality" no longer means open sesame to Uncle Sam's purse.

Any consideration of the worth of recipients of American taxpayers' money must give high priority to the nations of Latin America. As I have said before and doubtless will say again, this should be the most important area in the world to us.

With the exception of Cuba, the Pearl of the Caribbean which Khrushchev now wears in his necktie, our neighbor nations have first claim on our help. But this does not mean dishing out the \$20 billion earmarked for the alliance for progress with spend-thrift affability.

Here also the administration ought to be guided by realism. If we spend our money on the principle of "See what the boys in the back room will have"; the boys are apt to call for double slugs of the same.

In brief, we have got to find some way of making as sure as we can that our money benefits the people for whom it is intended, and is not used

1. To bolster corrupt and greedy bureaucracies, or

2. To perpetuate the intolerable division between the very rich and the very poor.

It is almost redundant to point out that either of these consequences would give aid and comfort to communism.

A case in the news at the moment is Brazil. The fourth largest country in the world and one which could be a tremendous ally in the cause of hemispheric freedom

is emerging from political chaos brought on by the irresponsible conduct of former President Janio Quadros—and let's hope he remains "former."

Quadros resigned suddenly and inexplicably August 25. A couple of days ago the influential Rio newspaper Tribuna Da Imprensa said he was sure he would be called back to the Presidency with dictatorial powers and further accused him of being involved in a Communist plot.

It is certainly true that as President, Quadros was a political Jekyll-Hyde. He was becoming more and more pro-Moscow and more and more anti-Washington, and yet at the same time in his economic policy he was an austere conservative. He tried hard to pull Brazil from the quicksand of inflation, which plunged the Cruzeiro from 20 to the dollar to more than 220 to the dollar. To give you an idea: A 1961 Chevrolet fetches a black market price in Rio of \$12,000.

The one thing we can be firmly thankful for so far is that Brazil seems to be coming out of the crisis provoked by Quadros without devastating civil war. The rest is no more than hopeful conjecture.

The new President, Joao Goulart, for example (a very rich man, by the way), has shown disturbing Communist leanings. As Vice President he was exchanging pleasantries with Mao Tse-tung when Quadros resigned.

It is possible Goulart is more opportunist than Communist. At one time he looked with sympathy on the Fascist Peron regime in Argentina.

Under the amendment to the constitution just voted, the powers of the President are sharply restricted. Most authority will reside in a Prime Minister.

Two questions still hanging are:

Will President Goulart try to chisel through the restrictions built around his office?

How economically sound and politically forceful will the Prime Minister be?

Until they are answered, there is no sense in rushing to the new capital of Brasilia, saying, "Please take our taxpayers' millions."

We certainly don't want to contribute to bumping the black market price of a Chevy to—perhaps—"twenty grand."

The Voice of America Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished newspaper writer and columnist, Mr. Constantine Brown, who has been living in Rome, Italy, for some months now, has had an excellent opportunity to get a look at United States policies through the eyes of the average European. The Washington Evening Star published on September 14, 1961, a column by Mr. Brown entitled "They Look to United States and Wonder: Voice of America and USIS Statements Called Disheartening to Little People." This is a most interesting column and points up the bad effects which the Voice of America and USIS broadcasts are having on Europeans who want to see the United States take a firm stand against the aggressive tactics of world communism. As Mr. Brown points out, they cannot

understand why these broadcasts speak of soft appeasement policies while the United States increases its armaments during the Khrushchev-created crisis over Berlin. I think this column serves to emphasize the need for having more backbone in our resistance against Communist methods and tactics in all governments and at all levels of government.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY LOOK TO U.S. AND WONDER—VOICE OF AMERICA AND USIS STATEMENTS CALLED DISHEARTENING TO LITTLE PEOPLE

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The free world wants to defend itself against Communist aggression; the enslaved peoples want to be free; the citizens of Berlin want to remain free. All these millions look for their salvation to America. And what they are looking for is strength, both moral and physical.

Americans who go about their daily lives earning a living, bathing the baby, marketing for dinner, going on vacations and reading the sports pages and ads in the newspapers, have no conception of the importance of every word spoken from Washington to the citizens of the rest of the world. Every policy adopted by the Executive, every speech on foreign affairs in Congress, and even the Voice of America, have a direct bearing on their fate.

I have seen in Seoul, Korea, people standing four deep reading the newspapers posted on the bulletin board outside the publishing building. The issue then was whether the United States would remain firm in the face of the Red Chinese threat to Quemoy.

I have watched people in Paris sitting in the cafes reading a speech by the then freshman Senator John F. Kennedy in which he sided with the FLN Algerian rebels against French colonialism. That he was at the time a young Senator whose opinions carried little weight among his colleagues was immaterial to them. To the French (as well as the Algerians) he represented America speaking.

I have only recently returned to Rome from Germany. On that warm placid Sunday when the concrete wall and barbed wire went up every single German was listening to his radio for word from America.

War and threat of war have made the world's little people experts on foreign affairs and those able to read their papers scan more than the headlines. Others may hear of the latest Washington policy from friends owning radios.

And the question uppermost in the minds of all, from the peasant tending the rice paddies to the mechanic working in a Berlin factory is: Will America stand firm?

For the past 3 months this reporter has tried to analyze and understand the effects on Europeans as he listened to the Voice of America broadcasts and the propaganda spewed from behind the Iron Curtain in many languages. The latter varies from sharp attacks against American imperialism, American vested interests and American warmongers to attacks on our strong anti-Communist allies such as Spain, Portugal, France, Germany and others. I have yet to hear any defense of these allies coming from the VOA. What comes across the air waves are full lectures on social science, interviews with unimportant foreign-born Americans, rebroadcast discussions by liberal Members of Congress and uninspiring dis-

cussions on current topics by the VOA's senior commentator Raymond G. Swing.

Besides conducting the VOA programs, the USIS issues an avalanche of printed propaganda which is being distributed to newspapers all over the globe. The Rome office issued recently a well gotten up brochure entitled "The Nuclear Ban Treaty; Gateway to Peace." After some platitudes such as "since the beginning of history the life of man has been shadowed by the fear of war," (a historically questionable statement), the author went on to say that now the hopes of mankind have increased because of the Geneva conference.

One cannot place any blame on the USIS for our unrealistic policy on disarmament and the nuclear test ban conferences. But the reminder to the peoples of Europe that we are stressing disarmament at this time can cause a drop in European morale as well as American prestige.

There are many more students of communism in Europe than in the United States. And one wonders what goes on in the mind of an Italian editor who reads not only of Washington's emphasis on disarmament in the present crisis, but who finds the same words used in the USIS handouts that he finds in Unita, the Italian counterpart of the Worker. I have been asked pointedly by one of the local editors whether it is the announcement from the White House for increase in American conventional forces or the policy on disarmament as put forth by the USIS which represents the real Washington policy. Surely, he said, a government cannot support both armament and disarmament.

Our Wayward Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Blairstown Press, a newspaper published in my home district in New Jersey, calls attention to the evils inherent in one segment of the press, and in so doing performs a service to the press and the Nation.

Under unanimous consent I insert this editorial, "Our Wayward Press," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OUR WAYWARD PRESS

Traditionally, the press has been a firm bulwark of liberty. And because people had that idea about it, the press has become a sort of a sacred cow.

We don't think we are revealing any deep secret when we point out that the press is made up of ordinary, everyday human beings. Some of them have been to college but that doesn't necessarily mean that they have any more sense than those who haven't been exposed to the dubious advantages of so-called higher education. In fact, the big words many newspapermen learn in college saves them the effort of thinking and they never do get around to learning how.

College-trained newspapermen today, with the exception of the oldsters whose numbers grow fewer every year, have been subjected to the influence of teachers who are Socialists, in fact if not in name, which explains why so many of them accept Socialist doctrines under various fancy labels without question or dissent. And since socialism is the bridge to communism, as no less an authority than Joseph Stalin once said, it also

explains why some newspapermen are dedicated Communists.

It's hard to detect a newspaperman who is a dedicated Communist because he acts and talks like a Socialist or a leftwing Democrat, or a leftwing Republican for that matter, since we are bringing politics into the discussion.

A dedicated Communist is exposed only when he pleads the fifth amendment before a congressional committee, usually after a defector from the conspiracy has sworn under oath that he is. He pleads the fifth amendment to avoid prosecution for perjury by denying the allegation and for no other reason.

The fingers of leftwing and Communist newspapermen tremble when the disgusting task of typing the name of that horrible reactionary Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is thrust upon them by harsh circumstances. And they abominate Richard Nixon, not for his faults—and he has developed a few since he was a hard-hitting Red-hunter in the Congress—but because he dragged the arch-traitor Alger Hiss down from his high place. For that terrible sin Richard Nixon will never be forgiven.

They love Owen Lattimore, Dean Acheson, John Stewart Service, Philip Jessup, and other fellows like that. They admit of no compromise with the Hitlers and other Fascists, and insist that they be destroyed. But they declare that the only sensible thing you can do with a Khrushchev, a Tito, a Mao, or a Castro is to negotiate with him. Negotiation with Khrushchev to them means giving him anything he wants because, they say blandly, a nuclear war is unthinkable.

As the Archbishop of Canterbury once declared, quite bluntly, there are other evils even more unthinkable than nuclear war.

Some newspapermen feel that these of their fellows who are various shades of pink and red should not be criticized in any way because, they are, after all, in the lodge, as it were.

We disagree. Newspapermen, who are loyal to their country, should criticize and criticize loudly those reporters who apologize for Communists, run around with them and, generally, play the Communists' game to the hilt.

That is why we applaud the editorial dissent of the Sentinel-Star, an Orlando, Fla., newspaper to the markedly hostile account by the Associated Press of the recent death of Whittaker Chambers, which the paper's editorial director, Wilson C. McGhee, sent to Frank J. Starzel, general manager of the Associated Press, with a covering letter to further protest.

The editorial said in part:

"The staid, powerful Associated Press handled the news of Whittaker Chambers' death in a peculiar way. Chambers, you may remember, was a \$30,000-a-year senior editor of Time, who, in 1948, put the finger on Alger Hiss, the State Department spy, who lost his job, his reputation, and his health. The only reason we can think of is patriotism. He made a clean breast of everything; he wanted to atone for his mistake by warning the United States.

"The AP's handling tends to indict him for being loyal to the United States. The AP calls him a 'turncoat Communist.' Turncoat is a despised appellation, and the inference is that anyone who turns from communism should be despised. The AP says that Chambers 'tattled.' Telling the truth is honorable but, from childhood, we are taught that tattling is unworthy. The AP says that Chambers 'recited' to a 'congressional spy-hunting committee.' Here the inference is that he merely repeated a cooked-up story, and that spy-hunting is not a serious matter.

"Whereas the AP calls Hiss 'brilliant,' it kisses off Chambers as being 'pudgy, short

and fat,' and says he 'lived with a woman outside of marriage.' This was before he married a woman to whom he was devoted for 30 years until his death.

"We are living in peculiar times, gentlemen of the Associated Press, when patriots are maligned."

We can't help but wonder who wrote that particular obit for the AP.

Mamaroneck Celebrates 300th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 23 of this year, the town of Mamaroneck, N.Y., will mark with appropriate ceremonies its 300th anniversary.

Few communities anywhere in our great country are blessed with more physical assets and finer people than the town of Mamaroneck. Its very name means it is located where the fresh waters meet the salt, and it has enjoyed superb climatic conditions for many years. Centuries ago, it was a haven for New York people of means who could journey there by carriage conveniently and thus escape the heat and rigors of city life.

Many prominent persons have contributed much to the history of the town. Squire Rushmore, Mr. DeLancey, Mr. Caleb Heathcote—mayor of New York in 1711—James Fenimore Cooper, the renowned author, and a host of other prominent Americans have contributed to the lore of the community.

Today the town, in addition to its unincorporated section, embraces two villages, namely the village of Mamaroneck and the village of Larchmont. Ample recreation facilities exist in both villages, and Mamaroneck's harbor provides a beautiful beach for the residents of the community as well as boating facilities for multitudes of yachtsmen.

On the occasion of the celebration of its 300th anniversary, the destroyer U.S.S. *Brownson* will be anchored in the harbor. Three hundred bearded citizens of Mamaroneck, whose hirsute adornments have been cultivated over a period of weeks to properly mark the celebration, will parade along with their ladies in gingham and cottons, reminiscent of colonial times. Bands will render stirring music and floats will remind people of the history of this famous area. A parade of yachtsmen will also be in evidence, and, all in all, it will be a great day for Mamaroneck.

The people of the community are indebted to Judge Charles M. Baxter, Jr., prominent citizen of the community, and to William G. Fulcher, famous historian of the town, for the work they have done to properly commemorate the occasion. The merchants of the community and the chamber of commerce have cooperated fully to help make the affair a success.

Learning the Evil Nature of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the startling events of the recent past must have brought home to even the most gullible of Americans the clear truth that we are today engaged in mortal combat with communism. No amount of fuzzy or wishful thinking can disguise the fact that the Communists seek today, as they have consistently sought for some 40 years, to defeat and destroy us. Yesterday by duplicity or treachery, today by subversion or blackmail, tomorrow by negotiation or force of arms—at all times, the Communists will not deviate from attempting to reach their goal of conquering the Western World. If we are to prevail in this great struggle, our Nation must develop swiftly a knowledge of the aims, tactics, and strategy of communism. This, plus a genuine will to win, will assure final victory to the free world. Knowledge of the enemy, then, is essential to ultimate success. This is the compelling message of a recent editorial in the September 12 issue of the *Lock Haven, Pa., Express*, "Young Americans," and indeed all Americans, "should know the truth of the Communist philosophy, which makes promises it cannot fulfill, uses chicanery and falsehood as its everyday tactics, and openly undertakes to conquer the rest of the world by means of terror, blackmail, and force." Because of the clarity and compelling reasoning of this editorial, I call the entire composition to the attention of my colleagues:

TEACHING THE YOUNG ABOUT COMMUNISM

We have finally swung from superstition to intelligence in our attitude toward teaching the young people of the United States what communism is. It is now proper to help them understand the greatest issue of their times, the fateful rivalry between the beliefs of a Communist and those of the citizens of a free democracy.

The idea of teaching a course in the high schools of our country, to familiarize pupils with the ideas and practices that go with communism has received growing acceptance. Only a few years ago, even in this community, a teacher ran the risk of criticism, even suspicion, by attempting to explain what communism is all about.

The superstitious approach to any danger is to shy away from it, to avoid learning anything about it, to shun knowledge as if it were contamination. This may be one way to avoid a poison ivy itch, or a contagious disease—but we should not forget that what we know about avoiding and curing these ills has been the result of study and research.

The person who can recognize the demure leaf of the poison ivy plant is safer than the person who can't tell it from Virginia creeper. We learned to control smallpox, not by running away from it, which people did for centuries, but by learning how to make ourselves immune to it.

This is what the study of the history, ideas, and practices of communism will do for anyone who has reasonable intelligence. Learning these things does not make communism attractive; on the other hand such

knowledge reveals its weaknesses, its falsity, and its complete negation of all human values.

What the student of the history of communism learns first is that the basic "principles" of this ideology were carpentered together by an egotistical German who had learned a lot of philosophy but knew nothing whatsoever about economics.

Karl Marx invented communism, literally, because he could not hold a job. His delusions of omnipotence were gratified by the hodge-podge of arbitrary theories he threw together in his embittered attacks on the capitalism of Europe in the middle of the last century. There was a lot wrong with the way Europe was being run in 1848, but Marx's panacea was not based on any economic, political or social truths.

Why, then, did it take hold? The student who pursues the study of how communism was foisted on the Russians, and how it has been forced down the throats of the Soviet satellites, will be dense, indeed, if he does not see how the Communist conspiracy hoodwinked first hundreds, then thousands, then millions of people, not with their own consent, but through taking advantage of their helplessness.

The student of communism will soon learn the difference between the American Revolution, fought for the principle of freedom through representative government, and the bloody butchery of the Communist revolutions, fought to prevent freedom and curb the gropings of common men and women for the right to live free lives.

Students of communism will learn, too, that the principles set forth by Marx and elucidated further by Lenin and Stalin, are not a set of moral truths, but a cynical philosophy of power-grabbing by whatever means can be used. They will learn that Lenin counseled the use of lies, treachery, and doubledealing, and that Stalin twisted the words of Marx and Lenin to suit his own dictatorial needs. They will learn that Khrushchev, too, has declared not once but many times, and in many different variations, that the goal of communism is to conquer and enslave the world—although in his doubletalk he says freedom when he means slavery.

Young Americans should know the truth of the Communist philosophy, which makes promises it cannot fulfill, uses chicanery and falsehood as its everyday tactics, and openly undertakes to conquer the rest of the world by means of terror, blackmail, and force.

They should know the enemy we face, because they, too, must fight that same enemy. If we do not have to fight with arms, we must not think there is no fighting to be done.

Khrushchev already has made it plain that he does not expect to have to win with weapons. He has served notice that he expects communism to find its way into the life of the free nations until they wake up to find themselves communized. If we are to foil this program, it will have to be done by letting every young American learn the whole ugly truth about communism as soon as possible.

Communism on the Map

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the American Freedom Academy, located in

my congressional district, has prepared a unique analysis of the film strip "Communism on the Map."

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the academy's analysis to the attention of my colleagues:

COMMUNISM ON THE MAP

We have been disturbed by the fact that criticism of the film strip, "Communism on the Map" continues, and apparently the criticism is being accepted as factual by some people. As you know, it remains only to repeat a lie often enough, to establish that lie as fact in the minds of those who will not investigate for themselves.

Thus, a committee of four members of the American Freedom Academy met and viewed the film strip critically. We sat for 4 hours, viewing each of the 231 frames of the film, and listening to the narration. Each frame and the verbal comment was discussed individually, and a careful analysis made.

First, we feel it is important to note that "Communism on the Map" is a factual narrative of history. It carefully documents the spread of communism across the face of the earth. So far as we can determine, it does not overlook a single major instance in which the cancer of communism has spread.

Since we, as Americans, Christians, and believers in the free enterprise system, oppose communism, we must therefore be critical of the conditions under which this expansion of communism has been possible. Therefore, we must be critical of the foreign policy of America during this period. The identity of the party in power or the President in office at the time of each communistic gain is incidental; the fact of the gain remains as a historical fact, inescapable.

Of the 231 frames, we found 33 that might be termed critical of the Franklin Roosevelt-Harry Truman regime. It is possible that this fact might occasion the idea that "Communism on the Map" is an attack on the administrations of Messrs. Roosevelt and Truman.

On the other hand, there were 22 frames that could be interpreted by Republicans as critical of the Eisenhower administration. Let us note, by the way, that in many cases, the frame judged critical of either regime, was ruled so only because a certain incident occurred on a certain date, whereas there is no direct allusion to any President or administration.

There were 176 frames adjudged as completely neutral; not critical of either party.

It should be realized that the Democrat New Deal-Fair Deal regime was in power for 20 years of the period covered by the film strip. The Eisenhower regime was in power for 8 years, a ratio of 5 to 2.

The aforementioned count (33 to 22) establishes a ratio of 3 to 2.

Thus, if the Republicans were as sensitive as are the Democrats, they would have better ground for protest on the basis that there are 22 critical frames covering a period of 8 Republican years, whereas there are only 33 frames critical of 20 Democrat years.

And when one analyzes the supplementary material supplied to bring the film strip up to date—all prior to the inauguration of the Kennedy administration—the balance is thrown even more heavily against the Eisenhower regime. In this supplementary, there are mentions of such events as the South Korean student riots, the Turkish riots, the Japanese riots, the Congo unrest, the Laos rebellion, the destruction of Trujillo, the rise of Castro, the defection of the American scientists Mitchell and Martin, and the student riots in San Francisco—all of which happened during Eisenhower's 8 eventful years. There are 13

paragraphs, designed to be read by the moderator at each showing of the film strip. All could be considered as to cast unfavorable reflection on the American foreign policy during the Eisenhower administrations.

Taking these into consideration, one might logically readjust his scoring as follows: Roosevelt-Truman regime, 20 years, 33 unfavorable mentions; Eisenhower regime, 8 years, 35 unfavorable mentions.

However, it is only fair to mention a suggested statement for use in the introduction of "Communism on the Map":

"This filmstrip documents some grievous mistakes and blunders made by various agencies and institutions in the United States which aided world communism and did injury to the security of our Nation.

"However, nothing in the filmstrip is intended as a reflection on the patriotism, loyalty and integrity of any agency of Government, the Nation's press, or any other institution. Some of the documentation does reflect on the vulnerability of individuals and institutions to the cunning Communist propaganda and to the unseen, insidious and powerful influences being brought to bear throughout our society by Communist intrigue and fifth column penetration."

We feel that the filmstrip, "Communism on the Map," is a faithful outline of the fateful years that saw communism grown from infancy into the major foreign threat to our great Republic. We feel that apathy toward this godless monster is the greatest internal threat to the future of our Republic. We feel that this filmstrip should be shown to every American serviceman and every American public servant.

We feel that the only person who has been maligned, through innuendo, by the filmstrip is former Vice President Richard Nixon, who is pictured with the butcher Castro as the narration tells how some Americans (such as Ed Sullivan and some New York Times reporters) inaccurately evaluated the rise of Castro. Mr. Nixon, according to columnist George Sokolsky, interviewed Castro (when the picture was taken) and warned President Eisenhower of the strong possibility that Castro would prove himself a Communist.

We, the undersigned, respectfully submit to you this analysis of "Communism on the Map," with the suggestion that the filmstrip be used more, instead of less, in the battle against communism.

WILLIS WATERMAN.
REV. EVERETT AUGER.
HOMER GREENE.
DONALD T. CARPENTER.

The Peace Corps

SPEECH
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7500) to provide for a Peace Corps to help the people of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, during the foreign aid debate, we heard a great deal of discussion of reported failures in our Foreign Aid program, and they have been many and grievous. If you examine them, most were not because of

failure to provide adequate funds or to provide adequate numbers of personnel. It was not the amount of our aid that was at fault. More often it was the manner in which it was given. The most important requirement for success generally is not how much, but how.

We have done extraordinarily well with the tangible things, providing calories, kilowatts, dams, fertilizer plants, steel mills, food, and all the rest.

Too often we have failed in the intangible. Too often some of our people have alienated the people to whom they went because they acted according to their own fixed ideas. We Americans have the imperialism of efficiency and it can be a cruel and resented imperialism. We knew what they should do; we could do it better than they could. We embarrassed them by exposing too bluntly their backwardness in their own country. They had to take our aid, but then resented it. We paid more attention to plans and papers than to people. We did not win their confidence and good will.

Some of us have long urged that we pay more attention to the intangibles, to the things in which we and other peoples are alike, rather than where we are different.

I saw the Chinese Communists make their gains in China. They did not talk about communism or appear to be working for Russia. They talked about helping the Chinese people down at the grassroots.

They said "We are here to help you solve your land problems, your educational problems, your health problems." They gave the appearance of great concern not for the Soviet Union or, for world communism, but for the common people of China.

Oftentimes we, however unintentionally, have given the impression that we were helping other countries only as part of the cold war and because they were useful to us in that struggle. To that extent we failed.

This is the essence of the reason why we need the openmindedness, the dedication, the enthusiasm, and the optimism of youth—the willingness to go into country areas and work on a simple basis with ordinary folks, trying not to promote some big world program, but to help people who are in need. When friendly persons come from abroad and help somebody meet his real needs, it cannot be misunderstood or misrepresented. It is recognized as genuine concern, and it is welcomed.

Most of these less developed countries have never known good governments, whether outside governments or their own. All governments are suspect. They are big and powerful and impersonal. Governments are rigid. The accounts have to be gone through by a general accounting office, and only previously authorized expenditures can be made. There is little room for flexibility and use of imagination. By its very nature government has these handicaps. But when a voluntary agency goes over, its people can be imaginative and flexible in their approach. They

have no axe to grind, no ulterior motive. The people recognize the genuineness of the effort, and they responded.

Mr. Chairman, most of us older people have acquired more or less fixed attitudes, even prejudices. We are sure our way is best. Without intending to, we tend to try to impose our will. But youth are less set; they are more willing to accept folks as they are and to work with them, more than for them.

Mr. Chairman, it is such considerations as these which have made some of us unhappy for years that the foreign-aid program has not made more use of the special qualities and enthusiasms of our own youth.

Last year in our committee report on the foreign-aid program we had a section on this, and I want to read part of it which I wrote myself:

It would be of very great value not only in creating a favorable impression of the United States but also in promoting sound and basic improvements in economic development if more places for such young people were found in oversea operations.

This followed discussion of some of the good projects which we had seen in southeast Asia being done on a voluntary basis by the young people of America, and to which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER] referred yesterday.

We further said:

The committee believes that the United States is failing to utilize one of its important assets by not developing a program for using such services. If young Americans with farm backgrounds and adequate technical training, who are willing to live in villages and share in the daily work of the people and who would serve with only a minimum salary and subsistence allowance, could be carefully selected and sent to the less-developed countries, they could be unusually effective representatives of the United States.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the sound rationale of the Peace Corps. But I must add that I was sorely disappointed when the bill to establish it was introduced. Too much of the emphasis in the bill was not on the plain hard work that is to be done or the people to be served. Too much of the emphasis—I am sure it was not intentional, but it gradually developed that way—was on the workers and the measures to protect and to serve them. It was not so much what they could do for their country, but what their country would do for them—while on the job and afterward. It emphasized the separateness of this particular group of Americans, their superiority, and so forth. As one of its sponsors wrote to me:

This separate approach has had special enthusiastic response from colleges, universities and voluntary agencies that have not found it feasible to work in partnership with existing aid programs, for various reasons.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps will stand or fall in the end on the kind of work done in the field, not on the initial response in the colleges or elsewhere. It is performance that will count, not public relations.

So, when the bill came to our committee its preoccupation seemed to be with

the benefits that were going to come to these lads, rather than the service that they were going to render. I felt that was more likely to reduce than to improve their chance of doing the kind of job that is so urgently needed, and the committee made substantial changes in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, not for one moment do I want to discriminate against these volunteers. But I think it is equally a mistake to discriminate in favor of them. Some say, Why should they not have all the same benefits as our foreign service personnel? Or our GI's? Or teachers here at home? Or even some special privileges, as I shall point out in discussing amendments I hope to offer? Well, I think this Peace Corps will succeed in considerable degree in proportion to the privileges the youth do not have. Asians respect men more for what they deny themselves than for what they gain for themselves. We must not do anything to kill something of the genuineness, the purity of motive, the voluntary idealism, the sacrificial spirit that must be the essence of this project, if it is to succeed in full measure.

Mr. Chairman, people often ask what gives the Communist youth their incredible drive and determination. May I read to you the first paragraph of the address given by Stalin in 1924 at the funeral of Lenin, and you will see why the Communists have been winning. He called them to nothing but hardship, and he promised them nothing but the honor of serving in a struggle to change the whole world.

Comrades, we Communists are people of a special mold. We are made of a special stuff. We are those who form the army of the great proletarian strategist, the army of Comrade Lenin. There is nothing higher than the honor of belonging to this army. There is nothing higher than the title of member of the party whose founder and leader was Comrade Lenin. It is not given to everyone to be a member of such a party. It is not given to everyone to withstand the stresses and storms that accompany membership in such a party. It is the sons of the working class, the sons of want and struggle, the sons of incredible privation and heroic effort who before all should be members of such a party.

Departing from us, Comrade Lenin enjoined us to hold high and guard the purity of the great title of member of the party. We vow to you, Comrade Lenin, that we shall fulfill your behest with honor.

No wonder they had stars in their eyes and have worked so contiguously and so successfully.

Mr. Chairman, we underestimate our American youth, and we do them a grave disservice if we fail to call them to equal "privation and heroic effort." They are willing to give their all including their lives if necessary for so much nobler and higher a cause. They want to do it. Let us not cheapen it by emphasis on benefits now or later. They will be so much better able to serve our country when they come back, as well as to serve the countries to which they now go.

Restoring of Rate Ceiling on FHA-Insured Mortgages to 5½ Percent Considered by Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal of September 14, 1961, under the heading "Restoring of Rate Ceiling on FHA-Insured Mortgages to 5½ Percent Considered by Kennedy."

Mr. Speaker, this article is self-explanatory. It is apparent that the administration in its endeavor to reduce mortgage rates only succeeded in increasing discounts that have to be paid on FHA-insured mortgages. No wonder the FHA is not making a better performance, particularly in view of the ultraliberal, and I might add, unsound, housing bill passed by the Congress this year.

The article follows:

RESTORING OF RATE CEILING ON FHA-INSURED MORTGAGES TO 5½ PERCENT CONSIDERED BY KENNEDY

(By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration is considering whether it should restore to 5½ percent the maximum interest rate permitted on mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

The rate was cut to 5¼ percent in May, and administration economists and housing officials frankly concede the reduction has not been accepted by the private mortgage market. Unless mortgage lenders begin making more 5¼-percent loans in the weeks ahead, and discounts narrow on these mortgages, the administration may decide to restore the ceiling to its pre-May level of 5½ percent. Through a discount, an investor lays out less than the face value of the mortgage, but stands to be repaid the full amount, thus increasing his yield above the stated interest rate.

The administration's decision on whether to return to 5½ percent could be a painful one. Officials from President Kennedy on down have been trying for months to force home borrowing costs lower. A cancellation of May's cut in the FHA rate ceiling would amount to an admission that the administration pushed lenders further than they were willing to go. Also, officials worry that the mere announcement of an FHA rate boost might be wrongly regarded by businessmen as a signal for a Government return to "tight money" policies that could hamper the economic recovery.

But administration men also worry over the result of leaving the 5¼ percent rate unchanged in the face of rising interest rates on non-FHA mortgages and other long-term securities. This, it's feared, would hurt the whole FHA mortgage insurance program and put a greater cash requirement on home buyers.

TREND OF MORTGAGE RATES

Housing officials insist they're not yet convinced that mortgage interest rates are headed inevitably higher in the weeks ahead—a trend that would about insure a return to a 5½ percent maximum FHA rate. But evidence abounds that mortgage lenders are cool toward the present 5¼ percent maximum.

Three examples:

FHA noted yesterday a slight decline, the first in more than a year, in the average price quoted for its insured maximum-rate mortgages on the secondary, or resale, market. This price movement halted a long, steady decline in the actual investment yields received by secondary-market buyers of FHA mortgages.

FHA's role in the housing market has been declining in recent months, indicating more mortgage lenders are shunning the agency's insurance programs. Last January, FHA insurance programs covered 20 percent of the nonfarm homes started that month. This share had dropped to 17 percent in June and to about 15 percent in July.

More owners of FHA-backed mortgages are trying to sell them to the Federal National Mortgage Association, rather than to private buyers on the secondary market. Officials regard this as a sign that Fannie Mae prices are becoming more attractive than the reduced prices being offered by such private buyers as insurance companies. Lower resale prices usually reflect a firming of the investment yields demanded by private mortgage buyers.

ONE GAGE OF TRENDS

Secondary market prices for FHA-insured mortgages provide one measurement of trends in mortgage interest rates generally. Sellers of such mortgages usually are original-lender mortgage companies wanting to convert them into cash for relending. The buyers are insurance companies or other institutions wanting mortgages for long-term investment.

Buyers in recent years have consistently been paying prices below face value for FHA mortgages.

FHA said the national average price paid for its insured 5¼ percent 25-year mortgages edged down to \$96.50 per \$100 of outstanding mortgage amount on September 1. This was down from the August 1 quotation of \$96.60. FHA officials said the amount of decline for 1 month was fractional, and within the margin of statistical error. But they did attach significance to the failure of the price to rise—a sign that the secondary market was not adjusting to the late-May interest rate reduction.

Secondary market prices behaved much differently following the Kennedy administration's first cut in the rate, to 5½ percent from 5¼ percent in February. Just before the February reduction, FHA's 5¼ percent mortgages were bringing an average of \$98.10 per \$100 of face value on the secondary market. Assuming repayment or disposal of the mortgage in an average of 12 years, this price yielded the buyer an actual return of 6 percent—a rate roughly comparable to that received by lenders on conventional mortgages not backed by Government repayment guarantees.

After the reduction to the 5½ percent rate, the secondary market price on March 1 dropped to \$97.10 for mortgages carrying the new rate. This was the market's way of compensating for the formal rate reduction in an effort to maintain the former level of actual yields. But the initial price decline was only half as big as that needed to maintain the former yield. By June 1, steady increases in the secondary market price had restored the quotation on 5½ percent loans to an average \$98.10, the same level that prevailed for the old 5¼ percent mortgage. To FHA officials, this confirmed the mortgage market's agreement that the 5½ percent rate was in line with market demand.

The failure of similar price trends to develop following the May reduction to 5¼ percent is causing concern among administration officials. For one thing, the wide discount margin of secondary prices below face value may tend to put upward pressure on home prices. FHA regulations forbid mortgage lenders to require the home buyer to

make up the discount directly. But this cost is often borne by homebuilders who arrange financing for their customers, and some builders have recouped the expense by adding it to the original price of their houses.

If yields on competing non-FHA mortgages and other long-term securities show signs of weakening in the weeks ahead, the 5½ percent rate may start looking more attractive to lenders. This would take the administration off the hook by allowing it to leave the 5½ percent rate where it is.

Use for Cultural Purposes of Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, several days ago I had the pleasure of talking with Mr. Marvin D. Myers, assistant to the director of Purdue Musical Organizations, Purdue University, who came to me with what I think is an excellent idea.

Since the Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater is now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, Secretary Udall has asked for proposals of ways in which the amphitheater could be used for cultural purposes. Mr. Myers has suggested that a certain time be set aside each summer during which various school and community music groups could perform at Carter Barron in a summer music festival. The groups would be chosen from among the numerous talented musical organizations which we have in the United States.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a letter from Mr. Myers to Secretary Udall which more fully outlines the proposal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALL OF MUSIC,
PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
West Lafayette, Ind.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Interior Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: On a recent business trip to Washington I had occasion to confer with several Members of the Congress, and in the course of conversations about various matters, learned that the Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater is now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and that the Secretary is desirous of receiving suggestions as to the possible use of this fine structure for the cultural arts.

By way of introduction, I am now, and have been for the last 14 years, assistant to Dr. Albert P. Stewart, Director of Purdue Musical Organizations, and am also assistant in agricultural extension music in the State of Indiana. In 1949, Mr. Stewart and I were appointed by the National Capitol Sesquicentennial Commission to promote and stage a program of festival music in the 1950 sesquicentennial program in Washington. In this connection, we became very close friends to Mr. Barron, and im-

mediately on hearing of his death, wired the Commission and suggested that the amphitheater being constructed in Rock Creek Park be named in his memory.

During the year 1950, we were successful in bringing to Washington over 6,000 participants in various musical and cultural organizations which performed in a temporary shell erected on the Capitol Grounds. Included were high school bands and choruses such as the male high school band and chorus from Louisville, Ky., and the Keokuk, Iowa, band from Keokuk, Iowa. Community groups included the famous York Pennsylvania Band with the singing Yorkmen and Yorkwomen. Also the Iowa State Women's Chorus of 400 voices, along with more than 2,000 singing Hoosier women from the Indiana State agricultural extension choruses. We also included a presentation of the North Carolina Grass Roots Opera Co. which thrilled an audience of over 7,000 at Watergate on the Potomac. The barber-shop singers, under the direction of Washington's Dr. Harmon, also attracted a huge crowd. The Interdepartmental Auditorium was filled to overflowing when the Purdue Glee Club, under direction of Dr. Stewart, gave their concert on the eve of their departure for a good-will tour of German universities.

The above groups are indicative of the many more which came to Washington during the sesquicentennial to add their talents to a great American festival of academic and community music.

The success of this program has always remained in my mind as, not only a great memory, but an inspiration that someday this type of program could be repeated in Washington, not only once, but on an annual basis. After seeing the beautiful structure, the Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater in Rock Creek Park, this desire became greater than ever.

Certainly it would be a great inspiration to American school and community music if, each year, the best of these groups could perform in their Nation's Capital. Furthermore, I am confident that an exchange program could be worked out with such overseas festivals as the one conducted at Llangollen, Wales. Our Purdue Glee Club has participated in this festival on two occasions and in 1953 met the famous Obernkirchen Children's Choir, which we were instrumental in bringing to America on their first tour in 1954.

The many loyal State societies in Washington would surely work for, and cooperate with such a program, especially in presenting talent from their respective States. I have heard such sentiment expressed by many people in the various societies. I have followed the efforts of Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, in his efforts in the cultural arts exchange program, and more recently with the efforts of Representative McDOWELL, of Delaware, also Representative HAYS, of Ohio, and Senator VANCE HARTKE, from our State of Indiana. I am sure that these gentlemen would all give support to such a program along with many others.

I would suggest, Mr. Secretary, that the Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater be used for a specified length of time each year for the presentation of a festival of American school and community music and related arts. I would further suggest that a committee, or commission, be established to work in accord with the Department of the Interior and the Secretary in establishing such a worthwhile program in freedom's great Capital, Washington, D.C.

I humbly present these thoughts and will appreciate your comment.

Sincerely,

MARVIN D. MYERS,
Assistant in Extension Music.

Should the Secretary of the Interior look with favor on this proposal, and should such a program be established, I believe that the cultural life of our Nation's Capital and of the Nation would be greatly enriched.

Denver, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the New York Times, in its September 15 editions, carried an article on Denver written by Gladwin Hill, one of its senior western correspondents. Mr. Hill, visiting Denver in the midst of the American Legion's national convention, drew a swift, impressionistic, and amusing verbal portrait of my home city which conveys its unique tempo and flavor at this heady moment in its history. He has managed to impart the bustling sense of forward motion, the friendliness, and the optimism which characterize Denver today; and, equally important, he has captured the essence of what makes Denver different from other bustling, friendly, and optimistic cities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, headlined "Boomtime in the Rockies," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 15, 1961]

BOOMTIME IN ROCKIES

(By Gladwin Hill)

DENVER, September 14.—Some fallout, supposedly from the Soviet atomic tests, raised radiation readings in this capital of the Rocky Mountain empire Tuesday. But it did not dampen a boom atmosphere surpassing that of the bonanza mining days. The mile-high city may get excited about small things such as where it is going to get \$13 million a year for public improvements or how to achieve a thoroughly honest police force. But the big things do not faze it.

This week brought forth, along with the American Legion convention, official approval of a 30-story \$12 million skyscraper; groundbreaking for a University of Denver sorority house (Gamma Phi Beta) costing \$175,000; and, under the gilded dome of the downtown State Capitol, further plans for punching a 2-mile vehicular highway tunnel through the nearby Continental Divide in the Rocky Mountains overlooking the city.

The new skyscraper will have plenty of company. A forest of monolithic modern buildings is already extinguishing the traditional brownstone character of the era when the capers of H. A. W. Tabor, the mining leader, and his much-sung girl friend, Baby Doe, kept Denver vibrant. Even the fabled Brown Palace Hotel now has a 22-story modernistic annex.

Yet the frontier ebullience remains. To test whether Legionnaires had gone sedate, the Denver Post in an echo of its yeasty days under the legendary Tammen and Bonals, sent out its prettiest girl reporter at-

tired in shrieking red to see if she could vamp any delegates. ("I've gotten more attention from a troop of Boy Scouts," she reported.)

While Denver's heart is urban, its pocket-book is geared to the hinterlands. There's joy over a moist season that has produced the best rangelands, for Colorado beef, since 1957 and helped crops.

Farmers seem to be winning in all ways. Sugarbeets will be big, and wheat farmers got the good news the week that the Government was figuring on easing the surplus by trading it abroad—for sugar. Thus emboldened, the grain men scorned proposals for a nationwide bread price increase as something calculated only to put them in the middle.

But all is not perfect.

The annual Denver Open golf tournament last week, won by Dave Hill, was a financial failure, drawing only 3,500 spectators while 15,000 had been expected.

The lack of interest was ascribed to an abundance of events. Sports fans had their choice of major league baseball and football on television and in-the-flesh quarter-horse races, greyhound races, or even Dick the Bruiser and Killer Kowalski on the wrestling mat.

And Denver has the common affliction of tax trouble. The city already has a 1-percent sales tax on top of the 2 percent States sales tax. Still short of money for basics such as fire stations and streets, it is afraid that additional city sales taxes would drive business to the suburbs.

Its neat solution—now in hot controversy—was to have the legislature create a Metropolitan Capital Improvements District comprising Denver and three counties. The area will vote September 26 on a 2-percent districtwide sales tax designed to equalize the burden.

Denver's other major civic worry at the moment is its police department, tarnished by the alleged involvement of a dozen officers in a burglary ring. Los Angeles' Chief, William H. Parker, known for the quality of his force, was diverted from Legion convention duties by city officials as an adviser.

Only once this week did Denver find its traditional hand of friendship rebuffed. At the Legion's arduous 6-hour parade, a citizen stepped forth to succor an equestrian, costumed as one of General Custer's ill-fated men, who seemed to be fainting in the hot sun.

"Leave me alone," the rider muttered. "I'm supposed to have an arrow in my back."

They Look to United States and Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Americans and the attitude of people toward America is a subject to continuing discussion, and I feel the article by Columnist Constantine Brown should be inserted in the *Record* at this point, and does not need further mention on my part. The article entitled "They Look to United States and Wonder," follows:

THEY LOOK TO UNITED STATES AND WONDER
(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The free world wants to defend itself against Communist aggression;

the enslaved peoples want to be free; the citizens of Berlin want to remain free. All these millions look for their salvation to America. And what they are looking for is strength, both moral and physical.

Americans who go about their daily lives earning a living, bathing the baby, marketing for dinner, going on vacations, and reading the sports pages and ads in the newspapers, have no conception of the importance of every word spoken from Washington to the citizens of the rest of the world. Every policy adopted by the Executive, every speech on foreign affairs in Congress, and even the Voice of America, have a direct bearing on their fate.

I have seen in Seoul, Korea, people standing four deep reading the newspapers posted on the bulletin board outside the publishing building. The issue then was whether the United States would remain firm in the face of the Red Chinese threat to Quemoy.

I have watched people in Paris sitting in the cafes reading a speech by the then freshman Senator John F. Kennedy in which he sided with the FLN Algerian rebels against French colonialism. That he was at the time a young Senator whose opinions carried little weight among his colleagues was immaterial to them. To the French (as well as the Algerians) he represented America speaking.

I have only recently returned to Rome from Germany. On that warm placid Sunday when the concrete wall and barbed wire went up every single German was listening to his radio for word from America.

War and threat of war have made the world's little people experts on foreign affairs and those able to read their papers scan more than the headlines. Others may hear of the latest Washington policy from friends owning radios.

And the question uppermost in the minds of all, from the peasant tending the rice paddies to the mechanic working in a Berlin factory is: Will America stand firm?

For the past 3 months this reporter has tried to analyze and understand the effects on Europeans as he listened to the Voice of America broadcasts and the propaganda spewed from behind the Iron Curtain in many languages. The latter varies from sharp attacks against American imperialism, American vested interests and American warmongers to attacks on our strong anti-Communist allies such as Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, and others. I have yet to hear any defense of these allies coming from the VOA. What comes across the airwaves are full lectures on social science, interviews with unimportant foreign-born Americans, rebroadcast discussions by liberal Members of Congress and uninspiring discussions on current topics by the VOA's senior commentator, Raymond G. Swing.

Besides conducting the VOA programs, the USIS issues an avalanche of printed propaganda which is being distributed to newspapers all over the globe. The Rome office issued recently a well gotten up brochure entitled "The Nuclear Ban Treaty; Gateway to Peace." After some platitudes such as "since the beginning of history the life of man has been shadowed by the fear of war" (a historically questionable statement), the author went on to say that now the hopes of mankind have increased because of the Geneva Conference.

One cannot place any blame on the USIS for our unrealistic policy on disarmament and the nuclear test ban conferences. But the reminder to the peoples of Europe that we are stressing disarmament at this time can cause a drop in European morale as well as American prestige.

There are many more students of communism in Europe than in the United States. And one wonders what goes on in the mind of an Italian editor who reads not only of

Washington's emphasis on disarmament in the present crisis, but who finds the same words used in the USIS handouts that he finds in *Unità*, the Italian counterpart of the Worker. I have been asked pointedly by one of the local editors whether it is the announcement from the White House for increase in American conventional forces or the policy. Surely, he said, a government cannot USIS which represents the real Washington policy. Surely, he said, a government cannot support both armament and disarmament.

Kennedy Acts To Counter Red Trickery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the *Record*, I wish to insert an article bearing a Washington dateline of September 14.

Again the managers on the part of the New Frontier have insulted the intelligence of the American people. Under terrific pressure from the frustrated public over the anti-anti-Communist drive that is now going on, the White House has attempted to soften this feeling by announcing the appointment of four advisers in psychological warfare. This would be fine if the President would appoint such people as Mr. Edward Hunter, America's outstanding person in the field of psychological warfare; Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker, another expert in psychological warfare; Adm. Chester Ward, and other equally talented personnel in this field.

However, he appointed his brother, Bobby Kennedy, who knows as much about psychological warfare as I do; Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, a brilliant labor attorney but certainly untrained in the field of psychological warfare; Mr. Alexis U. Johnson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; and for window dressing, Gen. Maxwell Taylor. This, then, is the Advisory Committee on Psychological Warfare and constitutes another step down the road to peaceful surrender to the international Communist conspiracy.

The article follows:

KENNEDY ACTS TO COUNTER RED TRICKERY

WASHINGTON, September 14.—President Kennedy has set up a Cabinet level group to give him a blueprint for psychological and political warfare planning and strategy.

The group is composed of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, the President's brother; Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, military representative of the President, and Alexis U. Johnson, Deputy Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs.

The Communists' ability to repress world reaction unfavorable to them, and to dominate the news as they choose with demonstrations that seem spontaneous, led to the creation of the new study group.

TAKE REDS APATHETICALLY

When the Russians resumed nuclear testing and many nations accepted the news apathetically, administration officials specu-

lated on what would have happened throughout the world if the United States had broken the moratorium. U.S. Embassies, they surmised, would have been picketed, perhaps stoned, and the demonstrations would have appeared to be spontaneous.

The seal of East Berlin at its western boundary aroused no world protest. On the other hand, if a U.S. Ambassador visits a foreign nation and is jeered or threatened by a mob, the mob action, in the opinion of Kennedy, dominates the news of the day, and the purpose, point, and accomplishments of the Ambassador's trip become submerged.

Government officials are aware that the Communist apparatus spark these demonstrations in foreign lands. Neutrals and nonaligned nations have remained silent in the face of Soviet nuclear explosions.

SEEKS TO COUNTER TACTICS

The President believes that somehow must be found to combat Communist techniques in cold war psychological tactics.

The informal group—Kennedy prefers not to call it a committee—was set up to find the answers. No Government agency now has the responsibility to conduct psychological warfare or to make broad policy and plans in that area.

Kennedy's four-man group is not an operations unit. It is understood to have held one, perhaps two meetings, and has little or no staff. Its assignment is to advise the President on what needs to be done, feasible ways of getting it done, and who should bear the responsibility.

Censorship of Military Officers' Speeches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, always in the forefront and ever vigilant in the fight for good government, and opposing communistic infiltration, is one of the most prominent businessmen of our Third District of Ohio, Mr. Loren M. Berry.

On September 11, 1961, Mr. Berry sent President Kennedy the following telegram:

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States, Commander
in Chief of the Armed Services, White
House, Washington, D.C.:

I respectfully urge you to set up a policy of commendation rather than penalties for the military for instructing their men as to the destructive forces of communism. The troops must know and understand that the threat to our freedom today is international communism and its dedicated aim of world domination.

I hope you will not hesitate to reaffirm the precepts which underlie our American way of life, freedom under God and justice under man. There should be no uncertainty in the American mind as to where the United States stands. Surrender and appeasement are not our heritage.

That same day, Mr. Berry also sent the following telegram to each member of the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House:

I respectfully urge you to support the investigation concerning censorship of military officers' speeches and instructions to

troops. The Communist cause has advanced greatly because so many citizens have been indifferent or complacent and even some of our soldiers do not know or understand the policies we have pledged our lives and fortunes to protect. A military man, under oath to defend his country against all enemies, foreign and domestic, should be commended rather than penalized for informing his men as to the menacing and massive global forces that are threatening to destroy our constitutional Republic.

There should be no uncertainty in the American mind as to where the United States stands. Surrender and appeasement are not our heritage.

LOREN M. BERRY.

The Reverend George W. Johnson Nominated for Office of National Chaplain, VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at Miami Beach, Fla., from August 20 to August 25, 1961, the Reverend George W. Johnson, oversea veteran with the U.S. Navy during World War II, and an ordained Protestant minister, was nominated for the office of national chaplain by commander of New York State VFW, Joseph Carl Thomson.

This nomination marked a turning point in national conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as the Reverend Johnson was the first member of the Negro race to be nominated for national office in the 62 years of national conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Comrade Johnson—all members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are called comrades—stayed with his fellow comrades from New York County at the headquarters hotel, the Fountainbleau, at Miami Beach. He attended all meetings of New York County as well as the New York State meetings. He was also present at all meetings of the national convention and had his meals with his fellow comrades at the Fountainbleau Hotel.

All the rest of this Nation can take an example from the Veterans of Foreign Wars whose ties are based on service performed on foreign soil during time of war in the armed services of the United States of America. Race, color, or creed have no bearing whatsoever on eligibility for membership, or for election to any office from the post level up in the national organization. Delegates are elected directly from their own post and any member can run for any office on any level provided he has a paid-up membership card.

The Reverend Johnson's nomination was received with applause and acclaim by the delegates from all over the country. When the Reverend Johnson learned that it had been the VFW custom for years to rotate the office of na-

tional chaplain among the various faiths and that the chaplain for the preceding year had been a Protestant minister, he went to the microphone on the convention floor and declined to run for office in favor of Father Brown—a Catholic priest from the Midwest—amid the cheers of all the delegates on the convention floor for his display of comradeship which is so much evident among the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., August 29, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: As author of the bill, House Resolution 211, please accept my most sincere congratulations. Never, has our beloved Republic faced a crisis, remotely as critical as the present battle to hold back the Red tide.

There can be no greater service than keeping alive the hopes for freedom of enslaved people the world over and offering courageous statemanship to we, who yet enjoy freedom.

Be assured that a great tide is boiling up in great surges to bulwark the tremendous stand, people such as you have taken in holding at bay and fighting down those engaged in the most insidious attack on civilization in the history of mankind.

May God bless you.

Cordially yours,

DONALD W. KILLIAN, Sr.

WAHPETON, N. DAK., August 30, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We wish to commend you for authoring House Resolution 211 to provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations. We are also writing of our approval to our Congressman SHORT.

Sincerely yours,

RUBY and ELMER BERTHON.

ARCADIA, CALIF., August 26, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We read with great interest and appreciation a copy of your recent speech on the Manion Forum.

We commend you most sincerely for introducing House Resolution 211 to provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations. We have noted a tremendous increase in grassroots interest and concern over the Communist menace in just the past few weeks, and feel your resolution is indeed timely and will receive popular support as the information concerning it spreads.

We are urging Mr. ROUSSELOT's full support of your bill. His record of integrity and courage has made his constituents feel very proud, and we are sure he will join with you in this effort.

Yours sincerely,

MARGARET S. BOHNSTADT.
CHARLES M. BOHNSTADT.

AUGUST 28, 1961.

HON. DANIEL FLOOD:

Wish to give wholehearted approval to your House Resolution 211.

This is a wonderful way to fight for free people.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. C. JOHNSTON.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.,
August 29, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your House Resolution 211 which would provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations, is a fine gesture.

We congratulate you for bringing forth this humanitarian piece of legislation. We wish you all success in its passage.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. MARJORIE L. SCHWEITZER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
August 25, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I approve 100 percent of House Resolution 211. I have written my Congressmen and urged their emphatic support.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. OBENSCHAIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 25, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to Mr. SAM RAYBURN, which should be of interest to you.

I have been deeply delighted with the success of the response to your House Reso-

lution 211, creating a Captive Nations Committee.

I think it is shocking that the administration has dalled, or even attempted to discourage such a resolution.

What in the world does it take to get some of these people at our own "summit" moving?

Keep up your great fight for the Captive Nations Committee. I was greatly heartened by your condemnation of our abject conduct in the Panama Canal a couple of years ago; and pleased to read your communication to then Secretary of State Herter on that problem. We need more men with your courage in Congress.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. SHARP.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 25, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: It is my understanding that House Resolution 211, calling for creation of a Captive Nations Committee, is and has been "bottled up" in the Rules Committee since its introduction in March of this year by Congressman FLOOD.

Surely this is one of the more urgent items on the agenda at this time. I cannot imagine a greater morale booster for the anti-Communist world, especially in view of the defensive position we are in on Berlin. We need a move that will show the world we take the plight of the captive nations seriously.

It is especially distressing to read that the President has discouraged consideration of this measure. In fact, it is hardly believable, and I will appreciate your informing me as to the truth of this statement, which has been printed in a reputable publication.

In view of our repeated concern for minority groups in this country, I think it would be a politically significant move on the part of the President to give this resolution his backing. These various nationality groups in this country would respond tremendously, to the passage of House Resolution 211.

I am deeply concerned over the axis of appeasement that runs through this administration like a yellow streak, and intend to do all I can, with my friends, to see that public officials who appease communism or turn their heads from its aggression, are not returned to Congress next year.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES L. SHARP.

FORT WORTH TEX.,
August 30, 1961.

DEAR SIR: I am interested in your House Resolution 211. Could you give me some information concerning its purpose and how it would operate.

Thank you.

ANGELO BENEDICT NASCHE.

Lunacy in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, dated September 15, entitled

"Lunacy in Katanga." It expresses the position that I have taken ever since the United Nations moved into the Congo. It is another example of the United Nations, whose military commander is a Russian Communist, delivering, or attempting to deliver, a free and independent province now in the hands of a pro-Western friend into the hands of pro-Communist Gizenga.

The article follows:

LUNACY IN KATANGA

The issue was in doubt yesterday in Katanga. Counter-attacking forces, loyal to the government of President Moise Tshombe, threatened to reverse the earlier decision at arms which looked like a victory for the United Nations wrecking crew in the Congo.

Through the haze of reports from Elisabethville one thing was certain: The Kennedy administration had sought to achieve a crowning lunacy by paying the lion's share of the bill so that the U.N. mercenary army could conquer the only peaceful, orderly, and pro-Western place in the Congo and turn it over to communism.

The U.N. force struck treacherously before dawn—in violation, according to Tshombe, of its pledged word, given the night before, that it would not move against the Katanga Government or seek to disarm Katanga's Army. After shooting up the center of the city and butchering resisting Katangese, the U.N. force issued the smug announcement, "The Katanga secession is over. Katanga is now a Congolese Province."

But, as Secretary General Hammarskjöld of U.N. arrived in Leopoldville, all smiles, the Katanga army and police smashed back under the leadership of Belgian and French officers U.N. had sought to expel. The fighting spread elsewhere throughout the Congo, and it remained to be seen whether U.N. could make its decision stick.

It was suicidal folly that the Government of the United States should ever have placed its support behind a venture to knock out the only regime in central Africa which supported the West against Communist ambitions. While anarchy prevailed in the rest of the Congo, there was no violence against westerners in Katanga. Its economy functioned and stability and order prevailed.

The U.N. excuse for its policy of disintegration was that it had acted at the request of the "central" government in Leopoldville to prevent civil war. So it went to war on its own motion to make the Congo safe for communism.

Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, has warned that the U.N. effort to foster a so-called coalition government in the Congo is "so heavily weighted in favor of the Communists that the outcome is virtually a mathematical certainty." The Prime Minister, Adoula, is, by reputation, a neutralist. Gizenga, his Vice Premier, is a cadre Communist, while the key post of Minister of the Interior has been awarded to Gizenga's most notorious henchman, Christophe Gbenye, a Communist trained in Prague.

As soon as initial reports of the U.N. triumph reached Leopoldville, the Adoula-Gizenga regime promptly moved in one of Gizenga's agents as its gauleiter in Elisabethville. This man, Egide Bochely-Davidson, had been Gizenga's high commissioner of state in Oriental Province, the stronghold of the Communist followers of the late Patrice Lumumba, first Premier of the "united" Congo.

Senator Dodd has recounted that the U.N. to date has spent \$100 million in the Congo, and that the United States has paid half the bill. "I cannot understand why or how the U.N. has converted itself into an instru-

ment of Communist policy in central Africa," said Senator Dobb, "and why the United States should be supporting and footing the bill for the United Nations military and police state operations against the anti-Communist government of President Tshombe."

No more can we, for if, as the Senator says, the Congo goes Communist, "it will not be because of Soviet intervention but because of intervention by a United Nations army, created by American policy and paid for by American money."

The British Government has demanded an accounting from Hammarskjöld about what has motivated his course, and has sent a government officer to the Congo to investigate on the scene. A similar investigation of the Kennedy administration's policy, as suggested by Senator Dobb in proposing the immediate creation of a select committee, is in order in Washington.

Anti-American Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the excellent editorial by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., which appeared in the September 10 issue of the Hearst newspapers, is most timely and makes sense.

I doubt whether our Department of State will take kindly to his suggestions.

The editorial follows:

NEUTRALS' STAND PERILS PEACE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

What with the cold war world series getting hotter by the day, isn't it about time we took a closer look behind the masks of some of the self-appointed umpires who call themselves "neutral"?

No question about it, these would-be arbiters have been making some strange calls—most of them impartial—against the United States.

Any time "Lefty" Khrushchev curves a low one way outside, they call it a strike. And no matter how fair our side hits it, these "neutrals" call it foul.

That's pretty rankling to Americans when we recall that most of these "neutrals" have been or are being rescued from economic misery by Uncle Sam—and with no strings attached.

I think a good rule for future foreign aid would be that neutral is as neutral does. A really neutral nation is the Swiss variety—it sticks to the meaning of the label and minds its own business.

There has long been sentiment in Congress for restraining our compulsive largesse toward foreign regimes which show their gratitude by habitually kicking Uncle Sam in the pants. Rumblings from the White House indicate parallel thinking there.

Naturally it would be better for the world if all nations were to recognize that the Communist Empire respects no neutrality and violates it whenever that course is useful to Moscow and/or Peking. However, it is not altogether practical to fault weak and fearful nations for trying to stay out of a fight even though their course is short-sighted.

But that certainly does not go for such as Tito of Yugoslavia, Nkrumah of Ghana, Toure of Guinea or lesser fry who did their

Commie best to steer the just-closed Belgrade Conference of "neutral" nations into anti-U.S. positions. It got so bad that India's Nehru and Egypt's Nasser found themselves forced to shy away from the bad company they were in.

I am inclined to go along with those who believe that the Belgrade circus cost Tito a lot of influence among nonaligned nations and added some stature to Nehru.

After all, peace is the name of the game for a sincere neutral, and support of the Soviet collision course on Berlin is bound to work against peace, not for it.

For the record, let's review U.S. aid toward a couple of the most arrantly anti-American neutrals—Tito and Nkrumah. Ed Edstrom of Hearst Headline Service's Washington bureau reports:

Aid to Tito's Yugoslavia since 1950—\$2.2 billion of which \$693 million has been military aid.

Aid to Nkrumah's Ghana—\$6.6 million since 1956, all economic, largely in the form of food.

U.S. aid has boomed Yugoslavia's economy and greatly bolstered Ghana's. Both countries have had their hands out for bounty from the Red side, too, but Soviet aid is harder to pinpoint, being mostly in barter or project building that can bear big made-in-U.S.S.R. tags.

As a force in the world struggle, the neutral nations sold themselves short at Belgrade. They had a big chance when the Soviet chose their meeting time as the occasion to resume nuclear testing.

But just deploring nuclear tests without condemning the Soviet action was meaningless.

The same goes for resolutions against colonialism which failed to mention the Soviet as the biggest colonial power of our time.

However well-meaning Nehru was in carrying the "neutral" peace plea to the Kremlin, all he has gotten is the back of Khrushchev's hand. Perhaps President Kennedy can be more polite to Indonesia's Sukarno and Mali's Keita, who arrive Tuesday on a similar errand, but at least he can tell them they've come to the wrong address.

It is not the United States that now or ever has threatened to break the peace.

In any case, it wouldn't be a bad idea to let them know that anti-U.S. neutrality no longer means open sesame to Uncle Sam's purse.

And consideration of the worth of the recipients of American taxpayers' money must give high priority to the nations of Latin America. As I have said before and doubtless will say again, this should be the most important area in the world to us.

With the exception of Cuba, the Pearl of the Caribbean which Khrushchev now wears in his necktie, our neighbor nations have first claim on our help. But this does not mean dishing out the \$20 billion earmarked for the alliance for progress with spend-thrift affability.

Here also the administration ought to be guided by realism. If we spend our money on the principle of "See what the boys in the back room will have," the boys are apt to call for double slugs of the same.

In brief, we have got to find some way of making as sure as we can that our money benefits the people for whom it is intended, and is not used (1) to bolster corrupt and greedy bureaucracies, or (2) to perpetuate the intolerable division between the very rich and the very poor.

It is almost redundant to point out that either of these consequences would give aid and comfort to communism.

A case in the news at the moment is Brazil. The fourth largest country in the world and one which could be a tremendous ally in the cause of hemispheric freedom is emerging from political chaos brought on by the irresponsible conduct of former Presi-

dent Janio Quadros—and let's hope he remains "former."

Quadros resigned suddenly and inexplicably August 25. A couple of days ago the influential Rio newspaper Tribuna Da Imprensa said he was sure he would be called back to the presidency with dictatorial powers and further accused him of being involved in a Communist plot.

It is certainly true that as President, Quadros was a political Jekyll-Hyde. He was becoming more and more pro-Moscow and more and more anti-Washington, and yet at the same time in his economic policy he was an austere conservative. He tried hard to pull Brazil from the quicksand of inflation, which plunged the cruzeiro from 20 to the dollar to more than 220 to the dollar. To give you an idea: A 1961 Chevrolet fetches a black market price in Rio of \$12,000.

The one thing we can be firmly thankful for so far is that Brazil seems to be coming out of the crisis provoked by Quadros without devastating civil war. The rest is no more than hopeful conjecture.

The new President, Joao Goulart, for example (a very rich man, by the way), has shown disturbing Communist leanings. As Vice President he was exchanging pleasantries with Mao Tse-tung when Quadros resigned.

It is possible Goulart is more opportunist than Communist. At one time he looked with sympathy on the Fascist Peron regime in Argentina.

Under the amendment to the constitution just voted, the powers of the President are sharply restricted. Most authority will reside in a Prime Minister.

Two questions still hanging are—

Will President Goulart try to chisel through the restrictions built around his office?

How economically sound and politically forceful will the Prime Minister be?

Until they are answered, there is no sense in rushing to the new capital of Brasilia, saying, "Please take our taxpayers' millions."

We certainly don't want to contribute to bumping the black market price of a Chevy to—perhaps—20 grand.

Talk of Disarmament Can Lead to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed at the present time to H.R. 9118, which would establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. There should be little question in the mind of any Member in this House, or in the minds of most of our citizens, that this proposed Agency for disarmament represents a repetition and a duplication of existing agencies. Again, we are asked to do something which we are already doing in many other fields. Or let me say this, if we are not doing it in these other fields as I think we are, it is an inexcusable thing indeed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the creation of this Agency not only because it is a duplication, but because I believe strongly it is the wrong thing to do at this time. Since the beginning of our country, we have always been a peace-loving nation. We have never sought an

acre of territory, nor an economic concession from waging war. The world knows this. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our peace-loving nature has often drawn us into war, and I am certain that an examination of our history will show that.

Look all the way back to the War of 1812 for a minute. We were drawn into that war simply because the British thought we would not fight it and that they could get away with their tactics.

Look again at World War I. Somehow we sold the Kaiser on the theory that we were too proud to fight, or that we would not fight in any event. We boasted then, as we do now, that we are a peace-loving nation. In fact, our President, at the time of World War I, was elected on the basis that he would keep us out of war.

And what happened in World War II? Again we proclaimed to the world our peace-loving nature. In fact, everyone in this room can remember our President at that time running for office for his third term, and telling the world, "I hate war." Obviously, we were not ready for war at that time and when it came, the Germans, Italians, and Japanese knew that we were not ready.

The Korean war? It is so fresh in our minds that I should not have to remind you of it. It was one of the major issues of the 1952 presidential campaign. Obviously, if the North Koreans, and the persons in the Kremlin who masterminded their strategy, thought that we would have stepped in to defend South Korea, the war would never have been fought. But our administration at that time gave the impression that we would not fight and, in fact, we had virtually written it off. So again, because we gave the impression that we would not fight and because we are so known to be a peace-loving nation, we were drawn into war. This war, incidentally, cost us some 50,000 American lives, and all because the Communists did not think that we would fight.

I was interested last night to read in the Evening Star the article "They Look to United States and Wonder" by Constantine Brown, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be included following my remarks. The article discusses the questionable content of the material coming out of the Voice of America broadcasts. The author makes one point clear:

The free world wants to defend itself against Communist aggression; the enslaved peoples want to be free; the citizens of Berlin want to remain free. All these millions look for their salvation to America. And what they are looking for is strength, both moral and physical. Americans who go about their daily lives earning a living, bathing the baby, marketing for dinner, going on vacations and reading the sports pages and ads in the newspapers, have no conception of the importance of every word spoken from Washington to the citizens of the rest of the world. Every policy adopted by the Executive, every speech on foreign affairs in Congress, and even the Voice of America, have a direct bearing on their fate.

Are these people going to be strengthened and heartened in their determination to be free to see and hear us talking

about disarmament in the face of the greatest acts of bullying and the greatest show of strength that the Communists have dared to display? I think not. Do you think for one minute that we can convince the people of Europe, and Mr. Khrushchev, himself, that we intend to be firm, when we appear to stress disarmament? Let me further ask this. Is there anyone in this room who for one minute would place any reliance upon any agreement by Mr. Khrushchev to disarm, after the insincerity and hypocrisy we have witnessed in the talks concerning the resumption of nuclear tests? I do not see how we can. More important, however, I believe this is the type of action that again tries so hard to stress our peace-loving nature to the rest of the world, that it also misleads our opponents with respect to the firmness which we will display. It is inconceivable to me that we should support such a program at this time in view of the peril we face. It is wishful thinking that will mislead not only our friends, but our opponents as well.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 14, 1961]

THEY LOOK TO UNITED STATES AND WONDER—
VOICE OF AMERICA AND USIS STATEMENTS
CALLED DISHEARTENING TO LITTLE PEOPLE

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The free world wants to defend itself against Communist aggression; the enslaved peoples want to be free; the citizens of Berlin want to remain free. All these millions look for their salvation to America. And what they are looking for is strength, both moral and physical.

Americans who go about their daily lives earning a living, bathing the baby, marketing for dinner, going on vacations and reading the sports pages and ads in the newspapers, have no conception of the importance of every word spoken from Washington to the citizens of the rest of the world. Every policy adopted by the Executive, every speech on foreign affairs in Congress, and even the Voice of America, have a direct bearing on their fate.

I have seen in Seoul, Korea, people standing four deep reading the newspapers posted on the bulletin board outside the publishing building. The issue then was whether the United States would remain firm in the face of the Red Chinese threat to Quemoy.

I have watched people in Paris sitting in the cafes reading a speech by the then freshman Senator John F. Kennedy in which he sided with the FLN Algerian rebels against French colonialism. That he was at the time a young Senator whose opinions carried little weight among his colleagues was immaterial to them. To the French (as well as the Algerians) he represented America speaking.

I have only recently returned to Rome from Germany. On that warm, placid Sunday when the concrete wall and barbed wire went up every single German was listening to his radio for word from America.

War and threat of war have made the world's little people experts on foreign affairs and those able to read their papers scan more than the headlines. Others may hear of the latest Washington policy from friends owning radios.

And the question uppermost in the minds of all, from the peasant tending the rice paddies to the mechanic working in a Berlin factory is: Will America stand firm?

For the past 3 months this reporter has tried to analyze and understand the effects on Europeans as he listened to the Voice of America broadcasts and the propaganda spewed from behind the Iron Curtain in

many languages. The latter varies from sharp attacks against American imperialism, American vested interests, and American warmongers to attacks on our strong anti-Communist allies such as Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, and others. I have yet to hear any defense of these allies coming from the VOA. What comes across the airwaves are full lectures on social science, interviews with unimportant foreign-born Americans, rebroadcast discussions by liberal Members of Congress and uninspiring discussions on current topics by the VOA's senior commentator, Raymond G. Swing.

Besides conducting the VOA programs, the USIS issues an avalanche of printed propaganda which is being distributed to newspapers all over the globe. The Rome office issued recently a well-gotten-up brochure entitled "The Nuclear Ban Treaty; Gateway to Peace." After some platitudes such as "since the beginning of history the life of man has been shadowed by the fear of war" (a historically questionable statement), the author went on to say that now the hopes of mankind have increased because of the Geneva Conference.

One cannot place any blame on the USIS for our unrealistic policy on disarmament and the nuclear test ban conferences. But the reminder to the peoples of Europe that we are stressing disarmament at this time can cause a drop in European morale as well as American prestige.

There are many more students of communism in Europe than in the United States. And one wonders what goes on in the mind of an Italian editor who reads not only of Washington's emphasis on disarmament in the present crisis, but who finds the same words used in the USIS handouts that he finds in Unita, the Italian counterpart of the Worker. I have been asked pointedly by one of the local editors whether it is the announcement from the White House for increase in American conventional forces or the policy on disarmament as put forth by the USIS which represents the real Washington policy. Surely, he said, a government cannot support both armament and disarmament.

U.N. Guilty of Savagery, Briton Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an article dated London, September 14, via the Reuter News Agency telling the story of the savagery committed by the United Nations mercenary troops against the people of Katanga and again bears out the futility of considering the United Nations an instrument of peace:

U.N. GUILTY OF SAVAGERY, BRITON SAYS

LONDON, September 14.—A British newsman covering the United Nations takeover in Katanga tonight accused U.N. forces of brutal savagery.

Richard Williams, a correspondent for the British Broadcasting Corp., said in a report from Salisbury, southern Rhodesia, that the U.N. action was a terrible miscalculation.

Williams, wounded in the foot yesterday during the fighting in Elisabethville, said the U.N. miscalculation had in effect developed into a national war.

POST OFFICE A FORT

Williams said that U.N. troops "have turned the Elisabethville post office into a fortress, partly surrounded by the Katangan Army."

"United Nations machineguns on the terrace and balconies of the Red Cross hospital 60 yards away were firing heavily all morning," he added.

"This morning, when a group of journalists approached the hospital, they were greeted by a long burst of machinegun fire from armored cars manned by Irish troops," Williams said.

STREETS DESERTED

"The streets are deserted. Anything that moves is shot at. Armored cars stand menacingly at street corners.

"Few people slept here last night. Heavy machinegun fire spat at the hidden enemy. Mortar bombs burst around us and bazookas tore into offices and private houses when Katangan troops tried to retake the post office."

Williams said that this morning a white-painted, clearly marked Red Cross ambulance stalled in the middle of the main square of the capital. The driver and stretcher bearer got out.

"Indian troops in the post office immediately opened fire at almost pointblank range," he said. "They (the ambulance men) collapsed on the road seriously wounded."

"This is the second time in 24 hours I have seen United Nations troops fire on a Red Cross vehicle."

OBSERVERS APPALLED

"All the rules of war have gone by the board in this campaign. This morning the Belgian head of the Red Cross told me he had asked Brig. Singappa Raja, the United Nations commander, to remove all machineguns from the hospital.

"He was told they would stay there. The hospital was a strategic post. It would not be abandoned.

"All foreign observers are appalled at the unrelenting severity of the United Nations assault. I am sorry to say that I have personally seen Indian troops act with brutal savagery which is quite indefensible."

Good Jobs, Schools, Fairplay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News and Herald, Winnsboro, S.C., of September 14, 1961:

GOOD JOBS, SCHOOLS, FAIRPLAY

Most Negroes, survey after survey has indicated, are primarily interested in better job opportunities, improved educational facilities, decent homes, fairplay on all fronts. Few, we believe, are concerned about so-called social equality, whatever that may mean, or even mixed schools, for they realize they may have much to lose in any such drastic changes.

A commentator on the local front, in a broadcast some weeks ago, came up with similar conclusions. And a well-known newspaper columnist, whose opinions appear in a string of southern journals, recently emphasized the job opportunity angle, saying the Negroes stand to gain immeasurably if

they hew to the economic line and avoid radical and controversial commitments.

W. D. "Bill" Workman, who would generally be listed among Columbia conservatives, quoted some Carolina tycoons on this topic earlier this month, among them being Jackson E. Spears, a vice president of Burlington Mills, and Charles E. Daniel, head of one of the Nation's top 10 construction firms (we trust he'll be doing some construction in Fairfield ere long). Mr. Daniel, a former U.S. Senator, who has been quoted in the News and Herald anent this same subject, said in part:

"We have a definite obligation to increase the productivity of our Negro citizens; to provide them with good jobs at good wages; and to continue to assure them of fair treatment. By raising their educational and economic status, we would raise the whole economy." That from one of South Carolina's (and the Nation's) leading industrialists. Or, as Mr. Workman succinctly puts it, "hard commonsense tells the white Southerner that he can't sell shoes to people who go barefoot or books and newspapers to people who can't read—or automobiles to people who can't drive. Commonsense should also tell whites and Negroes they can spend separately the money they earn together. Working together is one thing. Socializing together is an entirely different matter." For in the latter area, personal and private choice—and commonsense, again—should prevail.

Or, as a nationally known educator observed many years ago, "you cannot keep the Negro in the ditch without getting in the ditch with him." Or, as Gov. James F. Byrnes declared a decade ago, in regard to equal but separate educational facilities: "We should do this because it is right, and that, to me, is good and sufficient reason. We should also do it because it is wise."

In a county like Fairfield, where the non-whites are so numerous, we must constantly strive to raise the economic level of all the people, remembering that the Negro is often a more consistent buy-at-home body than some of the more prosperous potential customers who look across the borders at pastures that only seem greener.

But, of course, this is not a one-way proposition. As the Negro, largely with the aid of the whites—some of whom are not very economically secure themselves—endeavors conscientiously to improve his financial status—he or she must perform a good job where he is, meantime enlarging his capabilities, practicing restraint, and, in some cases, mending his manners (and at one time politeness was among his greatest assets). Or, again, as Booker T. Washington advised, "no race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem."

Gradually, by taking thought, we can advance economically, remembering that while money isn't everything, a minimum amount of it is essential to oil the wheel of progress in other areas.

Lunacy in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are conflicting reports filtering to us from the Congo, but from the least we can observe the U.N. is acting in a man-

ner beyond its jurisdiction; beyond the intent of its responsible members, and definitely working to facilitate the steady growth of the Communist struggle in the chaotic Congolese situation.

These circumstances are very accurately expressed in an editorial in this morning's Chicago Tribune, which I ask leave to place into the RECORD. The editorial is entitled "Lunacy in Katanga":

LUNACY IN KATANGA

The issue was in doubt yesterday in Katanga. Counterattacking forces, loyal to the government of President Moïse Tshombe, threatened to reverse the earlier decision at arms which looked like a victory for the United Nations wrecking crew in the Congo.

Through the haze of reports from Elisabethville one thing was certain: The Kennedy administration had sought to achieve a crowning lunacy by paying the lion's share of the bill so that the U.N. mercenary army could conquer the only peaceful, orderly, and pro-Western place in the Congo and turn it over to communism.

The U.N. force struck treacherously before dawn—in violation, according to Tshombe, of its pledged word, given the night before, that it would not move against the Katanga Government or seek to disarm Katanga's army. After shooting up the center of the city and butchering resisting Katangese, the U.N. force issued the smug announcement, "The Katanga secession is over. Katanga is now a Congolese province."

But, as Secretary General Hammarskjöld of U.N. arrived in Leopoldville, all smiles, the Katanga army and police smashed back under the leadership of Belgian and French officers U.N. had sought to expel. The fighting spread elsewhere through the Congo, and it remained to be seen whether U.N. could make its decision stick.

It was suicidal folly that the Government of the United States should ever have placed its support behind a venture to knock out the only regime in central Africa which supported the West against Communist ambitions. While anarchy prevailed in the rest of the Congo, there was no violence against Westerners in Katanga. Its economy functioned and stability and order prevailed.

The U.N. excuse for its policy of disintegration was that it had acted at the request of the central government in Leopoldville to prevent civil war. So it went to war on its own motion to make the Congo safe for communism.

Senator Dodd of Connecticut has warned that the U.N. effort to foster a so-called coalition government in the Congo is "so heavily weighted in favor of the Communists that the outcome is virtually a mathematical certainty." The Prime Minister, Adoula, is, by reputation, a neutralist. Gizenga, his vice premier, is a cadre Communist, while the key post of Minister of the Interior has been awarded to Gizenga's most notorious henchman, Christophe Gbenye, a Communist trained in Prague.

As soon as initial reports of the U.N. triumph reached Leopoldville, the Adoula-Gizenga regime promptly moved in one of Gizenga's agents as its gauleiter in Elisabethville. This man, Egide Bochely-Davidson, had been Gizenga's high commissioner of state in Oriental Province, the stronghold of the Communist followers of the late Patrice Lumumba, first Premier of the "united" Congo.

Senator Dodd has recounted that the U.N. to date has spent \$100 million in the Congo, and that the United States has paid half the bill. "I cannot understand why or how the U.N. has converted itself into an instrument of Communist policy in central Africa," said Senator Dodd, "and why the United States should be supporting and footing the bill for

the United Nations military and police state operations against the anti-Communist government of President Tshombe."

No more can we, for if, as the Senator says, the Congo goes Communist, "it will not be because of Soviet intervention but because of intervention by a United Nations army, created by American policy and paid for by American money."

The British Government has demanded an accounting from Hammarskjöld about what has motivated his course, and has sent a government officer to the Congo to investigate on the scene. A similar investigation of the Kennedy administration's policy, as suggested by Senator Dodd in proposing the immediate creation of a select committee, is in order in Washington.

National Milk Sanitation Legislation Will Have Senate Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the September 13, 1961, Dairy Record that tells of the Senate hearings which have been scheduled on national milk sanitation legislation. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, introduced this bill early in the 87th Congress, and the measure is being cosponsored by his Minnesota colleague, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, and by Wisconsin Senators WILLIAM PROXMIER and ALEXANDER WILEY.

The Senate bill is identical to the national milk sanitation measure I have introduced in the House and on which hearings are being held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. These hearings will be continued in January.

I am pleased that Senator HUMPHREY has been successful in obtaining Senate hearings on our national milk sanitation proposals, which would greatly benefit consumers and the bulk of dairy producers. The article from the Dairy Record follows:

SENATE TO HOLD HEARINGS ON SANITATION BILL

WASHINGTON.—Hearings on the National Milk Sanitation Act will be held in January 1962, before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, advised Dairy Record, Wednesday of last week.

According to Senator HUMPHREY, the chairman of the committee, Senator LESTER HILL, Democrat of Alabama, had assured him that adequate time would be provided for all witnesses to be heard and that prompt action on the bill would be taken by the committee.

It was also announced last week by Representative LESTER JOHNSON, Democrat of Wisconsin, that Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, had advised him that more hearings will be scheduled in January by his committee on the bill.

At the present session, the House committee held 2 days of hearings on the legislation but time did not permit listening to the testimony of many who had been scheduled as witnesses.

Representative JOHNSON, who has spearheaded the drive for the bill in the House, expressed renewed hope that Congress will pass the legislation in 1962. He stated that it will be a tough fight, but many Congressmen who had previously opposed the measure are now indicating that they will support it.

The Task for Free World Business Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, more and more the tendency grows not only in our own country but also in wide reaches of the world to stress the contribution by government to the well-being of the individual and to downplay, ignore, or downgrade the relationship of private effort to the general good.

Many of us in the Congress and throughout the American system have been laboring mightily to redress the balance, knowing that in unbridled governmental power rests the danger of extinction of human liberty; and knowing also that in a continuation of competitive free enterprise rests our best hope of keeping America and other nations free and economically strong.

Just the other day, on September 11, Mr. Neil McElroy, former Secretary of Defense in the Cabinet of President Eisenhower, and chairman of the board of the Proctor & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, served as chairman of the International Industrial Conference in San Francisco. At the conference were business leaders from some 60 nations, gathered to consider, together, the opportunities of private initiative to speed the progress of free peoples everywhere.

The fact that many of us personally know Mr. McElroy and esteem him highly is beside the point; the point is that this business executive has on a number of occasions, both in and out of government, demonstrated the kind of statesmanship which I think most of us would agree befits the industrial community of our country. I say this because I was present during his testimony this year before the House Committee on Ways and Means in respect to the President's tax recommendations and was there reminded once again of his broad gage approach to the current problems of our day. I mention this now because I have just seen an outstanding address by Mr. McElroy delivered at the San Francisco conference which I just mentioned—an address which once again emphasizes the critical role of responsible business enterprise in keeping freedom alive in the world. Because of the excellent way in which this point is developed by Mr. McElroy in his address, and because of the basic importance of the viewpoint he has expressed in our grim struggle with imperialistic communism throughout the world, I insert, under unanimous

consent, the address of Mr. McElroy at this point in my remarks so that the Congress and the public at large may have the benefit of its message:

THE TASK FOR FREE WORLD BUSINESS LEADERSHIP

It is a great pleasure to join in welcoming you to this Conference. The environment of the city in which we meet, on its record, is conducive to accomplishments of historic importance.

San Francisco, as you know, was the meeting place of the International Conference which drew up the Charter for the United Nations, 16 years ago.

It was in this city, a decade ago, that 48 nations joined in signing an enlightened peace treaty with Japan.

And 4 years ago, business leaders of the free world closed ranks in this same city in which we are gathered as they met in a dramatic International Industrial Development Conference.

That Conference proved to be, in the words of a distinguished participant from India, "one of the most portentous events in the history of world economic cooperation."

The Stanford Research Institute, which cosponsored that meeting, has joined with the National Industrial Conference Board in making arrangements for the Conference we are opening here today. Those who have planned this program and arranged the Conference are due the thanks of all of us. They have made possible an occasion for business statesmen from 60 nations to meet to consider, together, the opportunities of private initiative to speed the progress of free peoples everywhere.

There is a common purpose among us that can produce more than the individual gains we shall make through a free exchange of ideas and information. This exchange is a desirable end in itself; but beyond it, this Conference holds the seed for a new vitality among free institutions that can decisively affect the course of world affairs.

From our meetings there will come no proclamations or ringing manifestoes. We shall not leave here agreeing with each other on every matter we discuss. But we shall leave, I am confident, better prepared and more deeply inspired to meet successfully the momentous common problems we face.

The great, overriding opportunity afforded us here is to strengthen the alliance for the progress of the whole free world.

We cannot overstate the importance of this high objective. For we have far more at stake than the improvement of our individual enterprises, our individual national economies. At stake is the survival of the kind of society in which our enterprises and our economies are possible. We are at a crucial juncture in time when the abilities of our economies to stand separately depend on our willingness to work mightily together for their defense and their growth.

We face the fact that we have in the world today two strong political and social philosophies moving mankind in the opposing directions.

One is the Communist philosophy, which embraces the gospel of state-dictated decision with respect to the public and private affairs of its citizens. A fundamental political determinations of international communism is that free nations must be subverted to communism or be destroyed.

The other is the philosophy of the free world, which holds that free choice is the right of all men and that the purpose of the state is to serve individual opportunity and freedom.

On the one hand, we see totalitarianism set out as the price that must be paid for economic progress. On the other, we have the promise that human freedom is not only compatible, but interdependent, with the

raising of standards of living on a great world scale.

It makes no difference what may be the form of the political organization of our free world countries; it matters not whether your or my country is committed or uncommitted, a developed or a developing country. We are united in the resolve that we shall not permit the domination of the world by international communism or any other superstate. And in support of that issue, we are locked in a vast struggle over virtually the entire face of the earth.

We must accept the likelihood that we shall be engaged in this contest for decades to come. The totalitarian leaders are set in their course. We are dedicated to ours—to the determination that all men are entitled to the blessings and opportunities that only a free society can supply.

As we have come to grips with these differences, we have faced many crises. Without question, we shall be tested by many more, not of our making, but as a result of consistent aggressive action by the Communist world.

Today the critical focus is on Berlin. The situation the Soviets have chosen to create there is, of course, cause for grave anxiety. I do not discount it in any way.

But I would point out that the contest between the two major social philosophies is not concentrated in a single location or type of endeavor. It is with us, without pause, in many forms and in many places throughout the world.

While Berlin at the moment may be uppermost in our minds, we must give our continuing attention to the overall demands which this massive competition places upon us.

Of course, the most apparent is the opposing confrontation of military power. The development and maintenance of such awesome weapons of destruction as we know today is not something that moral men would desire if they could choose. But, for the free nations there is no choice, if independence is to be preserved.

Our very maintenance of great deterrent power is the world's best assurance that this struggle will not be settled by resort to force.

If we nations of the free world continue to combine our defensive strength in a solid front, and if we have the wisdom and steadfastness to keep our weapons in tune with our rapidly advancing scientific capabilities, our opponents are not likely to risk combat as the route to decision.

The outcome, then, will be decided in other ways.

The fact is that the Communists—most recently in the draft program of the Soviet Communist Party, prepare under Mr. Khrushchev's direction—have expressed confidence many times that freedom can be defeated by nonmilitary methods, notably subversion and economic competition. And there is no lack of evidence of the diligence with which they propose to move in these fields.

Our ability to carry the struggle of economic competition will underlie all of the factors that determine the ultimate course of events. Equally, let us agree that this is the field of competition we should most welcome.

There is ample empirical evidence that a free society has the inherent potential to give its people far greater economic benefit than the state-directed economy of a totalitarian society.

The contrast between West Germany and East Germany is an example standing vividly before the eyes of the world. Any traveler who goes from prosperous West Germany to dispirited, dull East Germany sees it immediately.

Since 1949, more than 2½ million people have left their homes in East Germany to take up new lives across the border. These people represent one out of every seven citizens formerly under Communist East Germany's rule. Until passage between East and West was forcibly halted, they continued to pour across into West Germany at a rate of more than a thousand a day.

What are their reasons for wanting to leave East Germany? It is not only that their spirits revolt against the police state. It is that the free society offers them genuine economic opportunity. Across from the stagnant, regimented routine of East Germany is a bustling, productive, rewarding society in which they can earn a good living for themselves and their families while working in dignity and without fear.

In the two parts of Germany, we clearly have a demonstration of the superior drive and productivity of a free as compared with a Communist economy.

Each of our nations, of course, must decide for itself how it intends to build its economic strength. But this fact should not obscure an equally essential one—that the continued freedom of each of our nations to make individual national decisions will depend on our willingness to make them in the interest of our common effort.

Unsolved differences between any parts of the free world complex will represent a weakening of our total position. Any rationalization of our problems will serve to strengthen it.

We are meeting here to consider specific problems and opportunities in our international business relationships. The subjects on our agenda are well designed to give us maximum results in these considerations.

But along with the subject matter, pervasive questions almost surely will be present in every meeting—every exchange of views—every expression of conviction—between us.

What can we do, as businessmen, to strengthen the free system the world over? How can we work more effectively to strengthen man's faith in freedom by furnishing him the opportunity to develop and maintain his own dignity and to work toward his own personal aspirations? How can we best help to reduce the starvation, disease and illiteracy that are stifling the majority of the earth's population?

For centuries these afflictions were endured because they were accepted as a natural state of being. Great sections of the world were isolated from progress. But today men everywhere know that a better way of life not only exists, but is attainable.

To millions upon millions, this knowledge is coming to motivate every judgment, every act. Nor is it difficult to understand such motivation when we consider that over half of the world's people live where the average per capita income is less than \$100 a year.

The Communist strategy is to take advantage of the discontent that occupies men's minds when they conclude that their existing society cannot meet problems which keep them in hunger and despair.

The Communist tactic is to win not by dissolving this discontent but by agitating it until even the surrender of liberty seems a bearable price to pay for the promise of a better lot.

The record shows, of course, that a better lot, in terms of standards of living, is far easier for the Communists to promise than to deliver.

Even in relatively promising Communist economies, the direction has been backward. Throughout the satellite empire in Eastern Europe, food shortages are chronic. In China, the Red regime has only intensified the threat of famine that stalks the Chinese people.

Nevertheless, the burden of proof is on the protagonists of the free society. We cannot succeed simply by pointing to the pitfalls of the police state. If we are to win the minds and loyalties of men, we must lead the way in causes they will support. The greatest cause to the greatest number of the world's people is elimination of the grinding poverty that envelops their lives.

This is not a task that can be achieved solely by our governments. It is a need that, in the ultimate, calls for large measures of the skill, the daring, and the resourcefulness of private initiative.

Working with cooperative government, business enterprise is the most dynamic force on earth for employing the constructive energies of men.

If we apply this force more massively to the erasure of poverty and the raising of living standards, we need have no fear of exhausting our resources in the process. On the contrary, over the long term, the goal of lifting standards of living the world over is compatible with the essential business goal of profitable operation—profits to be reinvested in greater opportunities to benefit more people.

What greater incentive for market development could there be than the potential represented by that half of the world's population striving now to find the means to become effective consumers in the market place?

The problem on which I am touching is perhaps the most complex and most difficult with which mankind is concerned. It is fraught with imponderables and discouragements. But it nevertheless demands urgent progress toward solution.

I would call your attention to two basic responsibilities that are vital to it.

The first is for each of us to manage our respective functions within our own economies with the greatest proficiency of which we are capable. The productivity of our free society depends on the initiative of its individual units, each putting such demands on itself for improved efficiency that the composite result will outstrip the progress of any dictated efforts of an authoritarian system.

It is management that spells the difference between success or failure for any business enterprise or for any free society. And when I say management, I mean those few men who, by the nature of modern management, give direction to the entire operation. Their direction, if it is capable, contributes in a critically important way to the productivity of the assets—both personal and material—of the enterprise. It helps to assure vigorous national growth and to produce maximum citizen opportunity.

Ineffective management is a devastating drag on an economy. It wastes important resources in capital and labor and lowers the total capacity of the Nation to provide sufficient jobs and adequate income for its people.

Wise, yet dynamic direction of our individual production and distribution units, then, is at the very foundation of our separate national strengths and our total progress.

Even as we acknowledge that principle, however, we recognize that far more is required of business leadership. We cannot devote ourselves to our business pursuits to the exclusion of other vital national interests.

The political and social determinations of our respective countries are—or should be—matters of basic concern to us. The problems and needs of our governments call for broad participation of business executives. It is essential that business have an articulate voice in the formulating of political programs that have impact on the economy.

Business leadership has reason to be deeply interested also, in the Nation's educational progress. The course of world history is turning as surely upon the relative levels of education among peoples as upon any other factor.

Our influence can be great in the advancement of universal and unfettered education in our respective countries.

As we exert our influence in behalf of better education, we fortify our free institutions, because sound education is essential to sound self-government; it is indispensable to the best development of human and natural resources; it is a matchless builder of individual dignity; it enables a people to appreciate other cultures, and to be more able to evaluate their own loyalties in the historic struggle between totalitarianism and freedom.

Our second responsibility is to plan together, in the most practical terms possible, to assure that our free industrial enterprise will grow in its value as a positive world force.

We businessmen have a long way to go in all of the areas I have noted—in management efficiency, in political and social participation, in advancing better education, and in making a maximum contribution to the alliance of free nations.

All of us here represented have much to offer in terms of cooperation for progress. Let us consider our opportunities together with a new magnitude of imagination, boldness, and pioneer spirit. Let us run the gamut of exploration into those areas of cooperative action that can lead to greater free world economic strength.

We have seen such cooperation cast in dramatic form in the development of great regional marketing programs, such as those in Europe and Latin America. We may well expect that other such developments can be—and will be—worked out in the near future.

Finally, let us keep in mind the importance of how our progress as economic entities looks to other nations, especially the newer nations.

All that we accomplish in friendly and productive cooperation serves as a showcase of the values of a free society to those undecided peoples who ask: Which kind of social and political organizations will produce the better life for us?

The competition most visible to mankind will not be in technology and science in themselves. It will be in the purposes to which these great forces are put.

If each of us in our own countries, and all of us in concert, will demonstrate the clear purposes of our society—the constant improvement of our living standards in an environment which protects all the satisfactions of living, working, worshipping and thinking in freedom—we shall forge decisively ahead.

I join with you in the confidence that we shall make of this Conference another great step forward to that goal.

Soviet Nuclear Blasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from "an alarmed citizen" concerning present world conditions and the Soviet Union's current series of nuclear blasts, and I

should like to share with my colleagues this citizen's views, as follows:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARVEY: The callous disregard for the safety of all mankind and the United States in particular, displayed by the U.S.S.R. in setting off to date, nine atomic explosions in the upper atmosphere, cannot be considered anything less than outright acts of aggression. Particularly, since the scientists are now fully aware of the consequences of such action.

"With radioactive fallout already settling on American territory, I see little sense in the United States failing to recognize this flagrant conduct as anything other than a violation of our border rights and thus an act of war.

"Since our food as well as the air we breathe is being contaminated, what do we need to awaken us to our peril, the explosion of an atomic missile in our midst? Surely the former is as deadly in the long run as the latter though not mercifully as quick. What more does it take to make us realize that world war III has commenced in earnest—a parade of Soviet tanks down Pennsylvania Avenue?

"Shades of another Democratic President who 'pussy-footed' in 1916—we can't afford a repeat performance of such an attitude in 1961. The stakes are entirely too great—the very existence of every man, woman, and child in these United States is in the balance.

"If the President is reluctant to act vigorously in this matter, I see no alternative than for Congress to grasp the reins before it is too late. This aggressive violation of American territory should be immediately recognized for what it is—an act of war—and Congress should act accordingly.

"Respectively yours,

"AN ALARMED CITIZEN."

Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, today when many believe that the way to get along with Russia is to yield and vacillate we have before us one outstanding example of a man who did get along with Russia in a superior manner, to our everlasting respect and credit. That man is Gen. Mark Clark, a man with an outstanding, distinguished military record for more than 30 years.

Gen. Mark Clark was one of the most brilliant commanders of World War II. He served as High Commissioner of Austria and later became commander of all United States and United Nations forces in the Korean conflict. His relations with Russia were always fair but firm. His record is one of outstanding success in dealing with Russia.

Following is an article written by General Clark which appeared in the Washington Star for September 13, 1961:

CLARK URGES FIRMNESS IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army, Retired)

CHARLESTON, S.C., September 13.—My country has given me many opportunities to observe the Communists firsthand.

While I commanded the 5th Army in Italy during World War II, a group of Russian officer observers was attached to my staff. Their political adviser was Andrei Vishinsky, who organized Communist activities in areas that our forces liberated.

At the end of the war, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria for 2 years, I negotiated with Marshal I. S. Konev, the Soviet High Commissioner, who recently has been placed in command of the Soviet armies in East Germany.

In 1947, I faced Communist negotiators across the conference table in London where I served as deputy to the U.S. Secretary of State, and in the same capacity I sat in the Moscow Council of Foreign Ministers in 1947 with Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State.

Later on during the Korean conflict when I was Commander in Chief, Far East and United Nations Commands, I came to grips with Communist tactics at Panmunjom during negotiations which led to the military armistice agreement for Korea which I finally signed on July 27, 1953.

USED SAME TACTICS

I found the Communists used the same obstructionist tactics everywhere I encountered them.

In Austria, all communications lines from Vienna to the American zone were through corridors set and controlled by the Russians and agreed to by the Allied Governments. The corridors passed through 110 miles of Russian-occupied territory. There was one corridor by air, one by road, and one by rail.

The situation was identical to the present one in Berlin.

The air corridor was narrow between Vienna and our sector. Russian warplanes began crowding us inside this corridor. Sometimes they fired on our planes, and one, a Russian warplane, fired on the airplane in which I was flying. When I found protests to Marshal Konev to be futile, I ordered American planes flying the corridor to be armed, and ordered our airmen to fire on any Russian plane that made a menacing move inside the corridor. I so informed Marshal Konev in writing. Never again did the Russians challenge us inside that corridor.

We had something of the same problem with trains. The Russians often halted our train, the "Mozart Express," when it went through their zone between our headquarters in Vienna and our zone in Salzburg.

I followed the usual pattern of repeated protests to Marshal Konev, and as usual he took no action. Finally, he was warned formally that our military police had been ordered to keep Russian soldiers off our trains.

Shortly thereafter several Red army officers and enlisted men forced their way aboard the train. As a result, T. Sgt. Shirley B. Dixon of our military police shot one Russian officer dead and wounded another who tried to draw his gun.

The Russians violently protested the shooting, but the interruptions in our train service ceased.

These and many similar experiences I had with Communists around the world demonstrated to me the necessity of using unmistakable determination when dealing with representatives of the Kremlin.

An incident involving Danube River barges illustrates, however, that we did not always follow this policy. Shortly after our arrival in Austria, the Russians stopped all shipping on the Danube. About that time I found that all Austrian, Yugoslav-Hungarian, and other river barges had been moved up to Linz by the Germans in the closing days of the war. Therefore, they were in the American zone.

BOUNDARY EXTENDED

The Russians persuaded Washington to extend their boundary to the Danube in the Linz area; so I moved the barges farther up

river to the American zone of Germany for safekeeping. I sensed that they would be an ace up our sleeve in bargaining with the Communists because barges would be essential when river traffic was resumed.

The Communists almost immediately pressured us to return the barges. On a trip back to Washington, I discussed the barges and gained the impression that everyone concerned including President Truman, agreed that we should hold them. At a conference with me President Truman said, "Mark, I heartily agree with you. You hang onto those barges."

Upon my return to Vienna, however, I received a message from the State Department, instructing me to return the Yugoslav barges. I replied that I was under the distinct impression that I had approval for holding the barges as a bargaining point. The Secretary of State said to turn the barges over to the Yugoslavs. I turned them over.

MANY SIMILAR INCIDENTS

There have been many similar incidents in our dealings with the Communists. They demonstrate that strength and determination are two things Communists respect and, skillfully applied, will prevent communism from achieving its goal of world domination that today threatens free people everywhere.

Fortunately, there seems to be a refreshing awakening to this fact. This is indicated by strengthening our military posture, and by the firm stand that President Kennedy has taken on the Berlin issue. His reinforcing our Berlin garrison and his forthright statement concerning the consequences of interfering with free Allied access to Berlin are the kinds of actions the Russians understand.

His sending Vice President JOHNSON and Gen. Lucius D. Clay to bolster the morale of the West Germans and demonstrate our vested interest in Berlin was also the kind of action that will not be lost on the Communists.

It is my hope that this approach signals that America has awakened, and that our country will pursue a courageous policy for firmness. Without such a policy we can never effectively negotiate with the Communists.

Marshal Konev once revealed their frustrating negotiating technique to me at a party in Vienna. After he had a couple of drinks of vodka, I asked him what would happen if the following morning I accepted all the preposterous Soviet demands then under discussion.

He laughed and said he would have 10 new ones to submit to me the next day.

In the face of such truculence, the free world must remain steadfast.

Let us have peace in our time, but not at the price of Communist slavery for ensuing generations.

Hon. Alan S. Boyd, Outstanding Chairman of Civil Aeronautics Board, Speaks on Role of Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to call to the attention of the Members an address recently delivered by the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics

Board. This is one of the clearest and most sincere statements I have ever read by a Federal administrative officer on the subject of the important role a Federal regulatory agency can play in cooperating with and complementing the efforts and goals of State and other local agencies of like responsibilities in accomplishing their objectives.

Alan Boyd is a close personal friend of mine. That my high regard for him as a person and as an administrator is well justified, is borne out by the fact that President Eisenhower tapped him for service on the CAB in November 1959. President Kennedy designated him as Chairman of the Board in February of this year.

Alan Boyd brought a tremendous record of achievement to this post.

He has been a member of the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission in Tallahassee. He was appointed to the commission by the Governor of Florida in July 1955. In 1956 he ran for and was elected to a full term on the commission and served as its chairman in 1957-58.

He was born in Jacksonville, Fla., on July 20, 1922. He completed his formal education at the University of Florida, and University of Virginia, where he received his LLB degree in 1948.

Mr. Boyd practiced law in Miami. He was appointed by Governor Collins in 1954 as chairman of a civilian committee for the development of aviation in Florida. He also served as general counsel for the Florida State Turnpike Authority in 1955.

Mr. Boyd served as a pilot in the troop carrier command in World War II from 1942-45 as well as in the Korean conflict. He has over 3,000 hours as a combat and service pilot.

The address of Mr. Boyd to the National Association of State Aviation Officials in convention at Miami Beach on September 13, follows:

It gives me great pleasure on two scores to be here with you today. In the first place, I am happy to have the chance to meet and address State aviation officials from all over the country. We have mutual interests and problems. That means we should be working together. In the second place, I am glad that you are holding your 1961 annual meeting in Florida because this is my home State. In fact, before going to Washington, D.C., almost 2 years ago, I served on the Florida Railroad & Public Utilities Commission and on the State aviation committee.

To a large extent my working background is akin to yours. Inevitably this makes me sympathetic toward you. I am hopeful that it will make you sympathetic toward me. I want for us to know one another well and to get along together well, not only because it is in our mutual interest, but because I believe that it is in the public interest. In our official capacities we are all servants of the public, whether of a single State or of the entire Nation. The public has a right to expect that we shall cooperate in the furtherance of its interest.

Admittedly, conflicts can develop between State and Federal agencies of like responsibilities at their respective levels. This results from the fact that we in the Federal Government must strike averages. Our policies and decisions of necessity move across State borders. In this respect, they

are like the aircraft we regulate. We must follow those aircraft from origin to destination as they do business in interstate commerce. There must be a high degree of uniformity throughout the country if we are to bring order to our national air transportation system.

We must be fair and reasonable to the public of each State. None can be discriminated against or favored. Each must give and take in the development of a healthy national airline network in the interests of our commerce, postal service, and defense. If, on occasion, the Civil Aeronautics Board makes a decision affecting an individual State in a way not completely in accord with that State's thinking, I hope that it will be borne in mind that we have also had to consider the needs and resources and thinking of that State's near and far sister States. In short, I ask you to consider the collective interest, just as we on the Board make allowance for the aviation interests of the individual States in arriving at an overall position.

Although I rarely voluntarily assign titles to my talks, almost invariably I am asked for a title whenever I am invited to speak on occasions such as this. The title I suggested this time is "Effects of National Aviation Policy on Community Interests." Naturally, we would want the effects in all instances to be good, though I am obliged to admit that this is not always the case on the surface or in a narrow context. For instance, in applying our use-it-or-lose-it policy in local service cases, we must sometimes order withdrawal of airline service to a given community or over a given segment. On the surface, that does not look good for one or more communities. In the narrow context of local convenience it looks bad. But by digging below the surface, it will be found that what we have done is in the interest of the taxpayer.

On what basis can subsidized service, at the taxpayers' cost, be provided where public need cannot be shown to justify it? The narrow context of airline service at a given point or over a given segment must be broadened to take into consideration the integrated economy of each company system. We have a duty imposed on us by law to promote those airline systems. If through regulation in the public convenience and necessity we hold system fares and rates down, thus holding profits down to a low and currently marginal level, it is incumbent upon us not to compel carriers to serve unpromising points or segments where public need is not demonstrated under fair and reasonable standards.

The foregoing illustrates how the effects of our policies on a single community or group of communities can look bad superficially, but how in the broader scheme, these policies produce good and sound effects. The bill to the traveling and shipping public and to the taxpayer must be consonant with their resources; service must reflect their needs, and the whole must be consonant with aviation economics. It is not a mere juggling game or a balancing act; it is fairness, reasonableness, and equity for all concerned. It is unlikely that everybody will get everything he wants; it is essential in this vital area that everybody gets everything he needs at fair cost to him.

This question of effects is one that can hardly be tightly circumscribed. I had the pleasure last month to speak before the West Virginia aviation seminar in Elkins, W. Va. I would like to repeat a few thoughts that I expressed there because they are applicable in my opinion in every State. It is exceedingly difficult to isolate any single community or segment from hundreds or thousands of others. Geographically community isolation is obvious, but economically, and our work is in economics, community isolation

tion is impossible of attainment on an airline network or on the national air transportation system. Each airline network is integrated, and each network is integrated into the national system. The effects of our decisions concerning any community or segment in turn affect every other community or segment due to this integration. The function of policymaking for the whole pattern must therefore be centralized, hence the role of the Federal or Central Government in aviation, which is an integral part of interstate commerce. Fare and rate levels and route alignments throughout the country are closely interrelated. This national web has been built to meet the needs of the public everywhere. To disturb it even within a State could produce ill effects far removed from that State's borders. To weaken the economy of a carrier within a State is to reduce that carrier's efficiency outside of it.

Our job must be to improve by regulation the economy and efficiency of air carriers in order that they may improve service to the public. Many of you are beginning to feel the effects of our policy of permitting trunk carriers to abandon service at some points in favor of local service carriers. The benefits of this policy are double. One, the trunk route carriers are relieved of the need to serve short-haul segments when the economics of jet aircraft require medium- and long-haul stages. Two, the local service carriers pick up points which bolster their economies and go toward getting them off subsidy and onto a self-supporting basis. This in turn makes them more attractive to capital, which they need. Their improved financial status will lead to improved services to the communities they serve, whereas obliging trunks to serve loss and unpromising stations to their detriment can lead only to deteriorating service. These are long-range plans, the effects of which on given communities can look bad at the moment, but which should prove good over a period of time. So you are asked not only to project yourselves beyond local places within your State to points outside, but also to project yourselves from the present to the future for a full understanding of the Board's decisions.

We are most anxious that you should have a full understanding of our aims and our decisions toward their accomplishment. We welcome State activity in aviation and look forward to your help. There is much that you can do in the way of insuring that the Board is fully informed on State and community planning, resources and needs. You have information and statistics which can help us arrive at better decisions. You can help expedite formal proceedings before us by consolidation of presentations of a like nature, thereby avoiding duplications from different parties within one State. I should greatly dislike for you to think that the Board would like to see the State aviation commissions go out of existence. The very opposite is the case. We want and need your help. There is no reason why we should be antagonists; there is every reason why we should work well together. In the final analysis, our aims coincide.

In the area of general or noncommercial aviation, you are in a position to do far more than we. Your airports are State, county, city, or community owned. The limitations of our terms of reference from Congress, our budget and our staff, and our preoccupation with commercial aviation make it impossible for us to play the role in the development of private aviation that you can play. Yet it is in the national and public interest that general aviation be promoted. It is good for the aircraft and aero engine and parts manufacturers, makers of navigational aids, builders of airports and airport facilities, suppliers, servicers, workers, in short for tens of thousands of persons whose in-

comes are derived directly or indirectly from aviation activities.

It makes our people air-minded in this age of the air. It trains our youth in aviation, in its mechanics and its operation. We have defended ourselves and our interests well in the past in large part because of our mechanical and operational aptitudes on the ground and on the sea. We have had a great reservoir of talent from which to draw for prosperity and progress in peace, and for our defense in times of struggle. That reservoir must be broadened to include persons trained in and knowledgeable of aviation. Commercial aviation is not big enough to give us the broad base we need. General aviation can be, and I hope you will turn your attention to it, and if we can help you in this endeavor, we will. We are not the leading nation in the world in the merchant marine, but we are the leading nation in the world in the merchant air fleet. We must maintain and improve that position. It can only be done by a public educated to the job and aware of its value. There can be no end to what can be done in the airspace and the space beyond that. Truly, the sky is the limit.

In the near future, we look to a breakthrough in helicopter operation. Development has proved costly and somewhat slower than we had hoped for. Only a few States enjoy sizable scheduled helicopter services but no doubt most of you have contact with nonscheduled helicopter activity. It is an area in which we, and the Congress, as you must know, are most interested. We will happily receive all the information you can supply us on the economics and planning of helicopter operations within your States. In large measure they may provide the answer to the vexing question of adjacent airports served by airline companies. The flying public wants to fly all the way and not drive for miles in the course of a journey by air. We are as sympathetic to this desire as we can be, but it poses serious economic problems for our carriers. As helicopter services become economically feasible, we look for them to close the overland gap in air travel. All that you can do to promote development which will not further burden the taxpayer through subsidization will be a great contribution to aviation. I hope that you will consider this in your airport planning. A place can be made for economical helicopter services, and surrounding circumstances such as regional airport location have a vital effect.

No doubt you have seen recent reports on Project Horizon. If you had no other evidence of our fallibility, you now have some. We are studying the recommendations with great care with a view to improving our own performance. We like to think that we are aware of our shortcomings, but the truth of the matter is that it is good for us to hear of them from other sources which also come forward with sound suggestions as to how we might do our job better.

In my opinion, you are uniquely qualified to serve as our critics. You are best able to understand and appraise our work because of your knowledge of the subject matter and the fact that you, too, are public servants dedicated to the public interest first. Others may know what we know, but they are not public servants. They do not have imposed on them by law the duties which are imposed on us, an imposition we seek and willingly accept. The source of our pride is in our official service to the public. Let us hear regularly from you. The Board is completely sincere in its desire to work closely with its individual State counterparts. We have recently set up a special Office of Community Relations in order to improve contact with the communities that you serve and represent. Regular and informal contact can go a long way to avoid the neces-

sity for expensive and time-consuming formal proceedings. We have long had the machinery for formal proceedings and we are in the course of overhauling and improving it through the reorganization plan submitted by the President and approved by the Congress. We are also streamlining our procedures. Still, if we can accomplish our aims under the law without recourse to expensive and long formalities, we will all be that much more ahead. Your constructive criticisms and help can be instrumental in bringing this about. Your influence, within your own States can be turned profitably to this end.

We ask of you only that we may serve your communities better. We anticipate a closer relationship which will enable us jointly to serve better those interests to which we are primarily dedicated—the interests of the people.

Poor Craftsmanship Said Handicap to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an article by Prof. Edwin T. Sandberg, chairman of the Department of English-Speech-Journalism at Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa, entitled "Poor Craftsmanship Said Handicap To United States," has come to my attention. The article presents a moderate point of view on the collective bargaining issue and suggests that caution and restraint are necessary in this vital area.

Mr. Sandberg's view that wage increases can be justified only on the basis of increased productivity is close to the viewpoint which Prof. Henry Wallich presented in his paper "A Standard for Non-Inflationary Wage Increases." I had the privilege of discussing this paper during our series, "Operation Employment."

Under unanimous consent I insert Mr. Sandberg's article which first appeared in the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, August 30, 1961:

WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR YOUR COUNTRY—
POOR CRAFTSMANSHIP SAID HANDICAP TO
UNITED STATES

(By Dr. Edwin T. Sandberg)

Much criticism has been leveled at President Kennedy for not being specific about the sacrifices required of the American people if this country is to survive in the war against communism. Such criticism springs from a failure on the part of many individuals to recognize that whatever hampers this country in its all-out struggle must be eradicated, and often this means the restriction of excessive individual gains at the expense of the national economy.

A good example of this is the present competition for world markets. In many areas of the world American goods are difficult to sell because they are priced too high in competition with foreign products. But not only is their price high—their craftsmanship is poor and their quality low. At one time American products were praised for their excellence, and the defective machine or appliance was the exception rather than the

rule. Today, in many manufacturing industries, good quality and craftsmanship are the exception rather than the rule.

In the current labor-management bargaining sessions, President Kennedy's words could well be heeded: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." Labor representatives should not demand any wage raises except those which can be justified on the basis of increased productivity. In some cases this might mean a reduction in wages if productivity has decreased or remained stable while other costs have risen.

In the past labor leaders have not been intelligent or courageous enough to inform their membership that the only raise that means anything is one which will not result in higher prices. They have failed in their essential functions and have fed the fires of inflation. In this respect the Chrysler Corp. proposal that some wages be reduced has merit, but an important addition must be made. Executive salaries are much too high as well, and a corporation that is truly interested in preserving the national interest should begin by paring executive salaries as an indication to union leaders that not all sacrifices are to be one-sided. Many executive salaries are exceedingly high, again adding to the high costs of producing a product. Moreover, featherbedding must be eliminated in executive circles as well as labor circles. The country demands that a searching look be made at any economy that can be effected in manufacturing, distribution, and sales.

But, as previously indicated, price is not the only factor in the labor-management problem. The poor craftsmanship of union workers and the planned obsolescence of manufactured products are the joint responsibility of labor and management. If union leaders were doing their job, they would demand better work of their members; they would insist that the worker assume some responsibility for the kind of work he does.

Poor craftsmanship of American products is even causing large numbers of American citizens to turn to foreign products, not always because of lower price, but frequently because of superior quality. Manufacturers, too, should demand better craftsmanship of their workers. They should appeal to the public at large when poor craftsmanship is characteristic of their laboring force; public opinion can often do much to remedy such a problem. And manufacturers should be sure that the materials they use in producing their products are of the highest quality.

Responsible leaders of labor and management should approach a bargaining session with this question uppermost in their minds: "What is best for the country and the public at large?" Selfish personal interests must be subdued and conquered if the United States is to fight a successful economic war against the enemy.

It has been suggested that consumers or the public be represented at bargaining sessions, perhaps under government direction. Such government direction should not be necessary. Labor and management should invite distinguished and competent experts representing consumer interests to attend such meetings, present them with all the facts, including corporation reports, labor proposals in detail, and planned increases in productivity that might justify a noninflationary wage adjustment.

The issue is clear; either such a proposal is considered seriously, and the two parties agree to reconcile their differences in the best interests of the consuming public, or the time will come when a government negotiator will be demanded by the public to protect consumers against indiscriminate, price-spiraling settlements.

Upon the shoulders of labor and management rests the responsibility of demonstrating to the world that the free enterprise sys-

tem can meet the competition of State industrialization; caution and restraint are the watchwords. To those who ask "What can I do for my country?" here is a simple answer.

Many Thanks to Our Catholic Forefathers of Slovak Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, recently, the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States and Canada, the largest fraternal organization in the world, held its 34th triannual convention in Pittsburgh from August 27 to 31.

Since I have the honor to represent many whose forefathers were of Slovak descent, I should like to call the attention of the Members to an article which appeared in the souvenir book of the convention:

MANY THANKS TO OUR CATHOLIC FOREFATHERS OF SLOVAK DESCENT

We wish to honor our Slovak forefathers, grandparents, and parents for realizing that we children are dualistic personalities—composites of body and soul—and therefore insisting upon and imparting to us the heritage of and opportunities for availing ourselves of a good and sound Catholic philosophy of education by making it a matter of their conscience and of their pride to send us to Catholic parochial schools, high schools, and colleges.

In doing this they have laid a religious groundwork imperative and useful in our day and age, since we are in the throes of a stagnation effected by the many untenable and empiric philosophies so rampant today. Furthermore, our Catholic forebears of Slovak descent have exposed us to a truly Catholic philosophy of education—a system which has for its purpose the education of the whole man—a system which is the only and most effective means to counteract the seemingly strong bulwarks set up by the Deweys, the Darwins, and the Rousseaus.

It is by this exposure that we can be truly successful educationally and in this success realize the three vital elements of Catholic nurture, Catholic guidance, and Catholic transmission of culture.

We are indebted to our ancestors for channeling our lives in such a manner that, fortified with a Catholic philosophy of education, we can be better equipped as lay apostles to lead back to correct thought the stragglers and those who have strayed away from right reason.

We are thankful that, possessing a Catholic philosophy of education, we are better able to eradicate or at least to make inroads on the rash of juvenile delinquency so much in vogue in our day.

Further, we are in a better position to indoctrinate and reeducate those who have fallen prey to the many unworkable types of philosophy attempting to invade our lives. In addition, we can better cope with the struggles and the pains caused by the ideologies that tend to draw the citizenry of today into fallacious attitudes.

Armed with a Catholic philosophy of education, we can more successfully ward off the evil insinuations of atheism and communism which are riding herd on one country and infiltrating steadily and aggressively

into other lands. Possessing a Catholic philosophy of education, we can attempt to reimplant and renourish the standard of morality and religion which these pagan ideologies have erased from the minds of millions.

Finally, we give our parents humble thanks and much grateful appreciation because we fully realize that it is the educated and thoughtful men—those brought up according to the right tenets of a Catholic philosophy of education—who will come to the fore to carry fearlessly and with a clarified certitude the standards and principles of Christ in the successful attempt to make all nations whole again—spiritually, morally, aesthetically, physically, socially, and intellectually.

Conquest Without War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the developing international crisis over the future of Berlin may have some salutary results. The Khrushchev ultimatum—for an ultimatum it is—has obliged us to review our position not only with respect to the divided city, but to focus our attention on the deeper meaning of the German question.

For the Communists, and indeed for the early Socialists, including Karl Marx, Germany was the key country of the world revolution. Neither Marx nor Lenin considered it possible that the first Socialist revolution could be victorious in an underdeveloped country, such as Russia of the czars. Industrialized Germany, with its educated working class, organized into trade unions, and in a powerful Socialist Party appeared as the logical battlefield of class warfare. Even after the Soviet revolution, Lenin and his followers believed that only if the Germans followed the Russian example could the revolution spread to Europe and the rest of the world.

Although the Soviets have tried to export their anti-Western feelings to the former colonial countries, Khrushchev, no less than Lenin, knows that the future of Soviet expansion depends less on the minds of the Asians and Africans than on the productive capacity of the Soviet empire. And this productive capability would be immensely enhanced if Khrushchev could add to the Soviet bloc the huge potential of Western Germany in the West and of Japan in the East.

Lenin spoke of a revolution in Germany. But even in the early twenties he offered the German Republic an alliance. Rapallo allowed the Germans to test weapons prohibited by the Versailles Treaty; the Berlin Pact of 1926 established solid economic relations between the Weimar Republic and the U.S.S.R.; and I hardly have to mention the Hitler-Stalin pact.

In spite of his threats, even while holding the possibility of extinction over their heads, Khrushchev again talks of a mutually beneficial alliance with Ger-

many. I would urge my colleagues to read at least some chapters of a new book, "Conquest Without War" published by Simon and Schuster. It is the nearest thing we have which compares with Hitler's "Mein Kampf" and provides an illuminating view of Soviet intentions. The editors of this remarkable work, Nat H. Mager and Jacques Katel, have selected from the words uttered by Khrushchev, particularly during the past few years, pertinent and significant pronouncements and placed them perspective so as to define Soviet objectives and methods in Khrushchev's own words. At this time it is particularly interesting to read a portion which illustrates the philosophy on Germany:

Another German-Soviet pact, like that between Hitler and Stalin, is at least as possible today as it was in 1939. Indeed Khrushchev insists, it is more probable, since a German attack on the Soviet Union would now be suicidal.

Khrushchev made clear to a German audience that such an alliance is exactly what he is looking for.

Chancellor Bismarck, a farsighted politician of bourgeois Germany, once said:

"It is my belief that, provided no irresponsible parties and individuals gain ascendancy in Germany, there will be no conflicts between Germany and Russia. For us, Russia's friendship is most important of all." Bismarck indignantly rejected the attempts by foreign powers to impose on Germany the role of a hound to be unleashed against Russia.

Another distinguished German personality of a later period, Joseph Wirth, former Chancellor of the Weimar Republic, said: "Until Russia and Germany began to quarrel with one another the two peoples lived well in Europe."

These, I think, are very wise words and they should be pondered by those who shape the foreign policy of the Federal Republic.

This echoed the hope of Lenin:

"The principal link in the chain of revolution . . . is the German link . . . and the success of the world revolution depends more on Germany than on any other country."

"A successful revolution in Germany would immediately and very easily have shattered the shell of imperialism (which, unfortunately, is made of the best steel, and hence cannot be broken by the efforts of any and every . . . chicken). It would have brought about the victory of world socialism for certain, without any difficulty, or with slight difficulty—if, of course, by difficulty we mean difficulty on a world-historical scale and not in the Philistine-circle sense."

After the recall of past wisdom . . . the promise of a bright future:

The German people are a very talented and industrious people. They have given mankind many remarkable discoveries and inventions. The German people do not need aggressive campaigns for lebensraum.

What prospect have the German people, then, with their relatively small territory? They have the broadest and brightest prospects. Today, when one-third of mankind is building its life under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the question of territories has been eliminated.

We do not regard the wealth of the Soviet Union as being solely our own wealth—it is the wealth of all the Socialist countries. That, too, is the view of real Communists, Marxist-Leninists, of other Socialist countries, who look upon their countries' wealth as our common wealth, serving the common interests of the people of all Socialist states. And this wealth is so great that it amply provides for the requirements of the peoples of all our countries.

The Soviet people want friendship with the people of the Federal German Republic, the same friendship they have with the people of the German Democratic Republic. Establishment of friendly relations would be a boon to the peoples of the Soviet Union and to the two German states, as well as to all European countries whose interests demand lasting peace in Europe and throughout the world.

We are not competitors. On the contrary, the economies of our two countries complement each other. The Soviet Union possesses inexhaustible raw materials and industrial resources. We have unlimited opportunities for the production of agricultural raw materials and food, and the Germans could cooperate with us. This cooperation would be advantageous to both countries, and the well-being of our peoples would be raised to a new high.

Some political leaders in countries allied with West Germany in NATO candidly and directly say—behind the scenes, to be sure, and not in public: "Believe and understand us, if the Federal German Republic were not a member of NATO, had no army, and spent nothing on armament, it would have great economic advantages over other Western countries, and would become an even more dangerous trade rival." The West German economy is indeed strong and more highly developed than that of other NATO countries, excluding the United States. Thus, for such Western politicians the development of the West German economy—while West Germany is being dragged into NATO and participating in the arms race—is most beneficial. They are not averse to putting their West German competitor in the heavy chains of armaments and large armed forces in order to weaken the Federal German Republic economically, to create better conditions for competing with it in world markets.

The wounds of the past are far from healed: Germany is still a divided country. Khrushchev does not intend to accept reunification unless a reunified Germany would ally itself with the Soviet Union.

We Are Going To Be Taken Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Chester Reporter, Chester, S.C., of September 13, 1961:

WE ARE GOING TO BE TAKEN AGAIN

While the so-called astute statesmen of the free world are holding up their hands in horror over Soviet Russia's resumption of nuclear testing, let's not lose sight of Mr. Khrushchev's Pavlovian cleverness.

He announces that because no agreement banning nuclear testing is possible with the United States, Russia will resume testing. Five test shots in a week's time indicate clearly that Russia had been preparing for that week's work for many months.

By the time Russia has completed the tests needed to prove out her new nuclear devices, the upper atmosphere will be so loaded with radioactive materials that good old Khrushchev will act generously to save civilization by agreeing once again to discuss a ban on nuclear testing.

What Russia does with impunity, the United States cannot do at all. The world

will be so grateful to Soviet Russia for calling another time out in this desperate game that it will turn with fury on the United States if any suggestion is made that we need to catch up with a few test shots of our own.

The manipulation of world opinion by the Communists has approached the laboratory perfection of Dr. Pavlov and his dogs. When Khrushchev tinkles the little bell of peace, our mouths water. We have been conditioned to forget who beats us on the head because it feels so good when they stop.

It is terrifying to see the Communists so adept in this, but it looks as if we are going to be taken again.

My True Security: The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, a talented young lady in Morrilton, Ark.—Miss Mary Louise Warren—is the author of an inspiring essay entitled, "My True Security: The American Way," which was selected as the best entered in a contest conducted by the junior chamber of commerce of Conway County, Ark. Because this essay contains a real message for all of us, I include a copy in the Record:

MY TRUE SECURITY: THE AMERICAN WAY

The word "security" has been used so loosely it flaps. If I am secure I am presumed to be happy, well liked, and something called adjusted. If I am not secure I am incorrigible, defective, or warped—and heaven help me. I am not any of these—I am a teenager working toward my security. Such opinion misleads me into a feeling for what security most decidedly is not—that is, wrapping my life up in neatly labeled packages so that I need not bother about it again.

To me, security is a continuous development; and when I realize this fact, I show a mark of feeling secure. I feel I cannot arrive at security in some magical moment and stay there for the rest of my life. To be secure I must be aware of my own readiness as I move from one accomplishment to the next.

Security is not a state I can reach suddenly; it is achieved by wisdom and personal effort. I cannot find security by rules and formulas; neither can I find it through social security, Federal housing, TVA, minimum wage, or subsidies to farmers. Security is a road to a destination. It has, of course, some guideposts giving directions to me. With the help of God, the love of family, and honest labor, I can travel along my path to greater security. I must not be detoured into a "give me, give me, give me," lane used so much today, in the name of security.

Our forefathers had no Federal aids, no public welfare; yet, in spite of this, they had a security in one unified goal—freedom. They built security that warrants our highest praise. I feel that we, as the new generation, must "right about face," and capture some of their grim determination for self reliance, independence, honesty, and self respect—or we will be a lost nation.

"The world is a looking glass, and gives back to every man the reflection of his own face." We need the courage to admit to ourselves that we, all of us, make our own world.

Security comes from within an individual. After I have used my effort and wisdom well to build a character with integrity, foresight, initiative and self reliance—one capable of meeting crises or able to take advantage of opportunities, only then do I possess my true security.

Monsignor McHugh's Crowning Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Connel A. McHugh, P.A., V.F., pastor of St. Mary of the Mount Church at Mount Pocono, Pa., is and has been for many years one of the most outstanding and distinguished priests in the Catholic diocese of Scranton, which includes my congressional district. I have known and on many occasions have been closely associated with Monsignor McHugh during the course of his long and illustrious career as a member of the clergy. I am sure Monsignor McHugh would agree that his greatest accomplishment, among many, was the occasion of the recent dedication of the Pocono Catholic Mission's elementary and secondary school and convent which the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Friday, September 15, 1961, described editorially as "the crowning achievement in the fruitful career" of Monsignor McHugh.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the excellent aforementioned editorial:

MONSIGNOR MCHUGH'S CROWNING ACHIEVEMENT

Dedication of the Pocono Catholic Missions \$2 million elementary and secondary school and convent on a 40-acre site in Paradise Township has been quite properly described as the crowning achievement in the fruitful career of the Right Reverend Monsignor Connel A. McHugh, P.A., V.F., pastor of St. Mary of the Mount Church at Mount Pocono and one of the most distinguished priests in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Scranton.

The institution, located 3 miles southeast of Mount Pocono on the road to Cresco, Mountainhome and Buckhill Falls, already is a familiar landmark in the area and in the years to come will be a monument to Monsignor McHugh's zeal.

A priest for 56 years, Monsignor McHugh undertook this tremendous building program at an age when most men of the cloth, as well as members of the laity, are content to sit on the sidelines and watch the world go by. Now in his eighties, Monsignor McHugh shows no diminution of initiative and enthusiasm as he continues to fulfill the vows he took after the turn of the century. The years wear lightly on him, as he maintains a rigorous schedule 7 days a week.

Monsignor McHugh's career is remarkable in that he has labored in rural parishes except for a decade in Scranton as a young curate. Because of his activities and accomplishments as a citizen as well as a churchman, he easily qualifies as the Poconos' outstanding son. His fame has spread

far beyond the boundaries of the resort area and the diocese.

A grateful church has conferred on him the ranks of domestic prelate and protonotary apostolic, the highest honors a priest may receive. In the diocese, he has served in such capacities as vicar general, dean, and consultor. He has been on the board of the Catholic Light, chairman of the orphanage building committee, and director of religious work in camps. But it is in his pastoral role that he has best demonstrated his capacity.

Evidence of his stature was indicated at the dedication when he received messages from Pope John XXIII, the apostolic delegate at Washington, President Kennedy, Governor Lawrence, and other notables. Many members of the hierarchy participated in the exercises as a special tribute to him.

Wilkes-Barre always has taken a keen interest in his career because he spent his boyhood at the home of Mr. and Mrs. John C. Ritchie in the North End. It was from this city that he left to study for the priesthood. Ellen and Sara Ritchie of Wilkes-Barre are nieces and Attorney George B. Ritchie is a grandnephew. A part from these ties, he has hundreds of local friends who rejoice not only in his impressive record of service to God and man, but in the knowledge that the final chapter is yet to be written.

Our Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under a unanimous-consent agreement I am pleased to present herewith a splendid article which appears in the September 20 issue of Life Lines.

This article calls attention to the observance of Constitution Week and concludes with the statement:

As long as freedom's light is shining in America, freedom's hope will not die in the hearts of those who do not know liberty.

The article entitled "Our Bill of Rights" follows:

OUR BILL OF RIGHTS

During the coming days, Americans from Maine to California and from the border of Canada to the Gulf of Mexico will be joining in the observance of Constitution Week. One hundred seventy-four years ago, the Founding Fathers gave to America the charter of her liberties.

This is a time for Americans to determine that the sacrifice, the wisdom, and the faith of those who wrote the Constitution shall not perish from the earth. This is a time for Americans to resolve firmly that they will know more tomorrow than they know today about ways and means of insuring the maintenance of the freedom guaranteed by the Constitution.

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Gladstone once described the formation of the Constitution as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the

brain and purpose of man." The American Constitution is perhaps the most successful example in history of a legal instrument that has served both as a safeguard of individual freedom and as a ligament of national unity. Today it is still a living document, meeting the needs of a great, growing, powerful, self-governing Republic.

Today it seems appropriate to read again our Bill of Rights. The following first 10 amendments to the Constitution were all proposed by Congress on September 25, 1789, and were ratified and adopted on December 15, 1791:

"Amendment I—Freedom of religion, of speech and of the press: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"Amendment II—Right to keep and bear arms: A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

"Amendment III—Quartering of soldiers: No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

"Amendment IV—Security from unwarrantable search and seizure: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

"Amendment V—Rights of accused in criminal proceedings: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

"Amendment VI—Right to speedy trial witnesses, etc.: In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

"Amendment VII—Trial by jury in civil cases: In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

"Amendment VIII—Bails, fines, punishment: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

"Amendment IX—Reservation of rights of the people: The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"Amendment X—Powers reserved to States or people: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor pro-

hibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Why is the philosophy of government called a representative republic peculiar to our United States? Until the American Revolution it was accepted that the king or state held complete sovereignty and was the fountainhead of power and the dispenser of privilege. The great feature of the American philosophy of government is that sovereignty resides in the individual citizen. The Founding Fathers held that the rights of freedom of the individual are conferred by God and that these rights are inalienable. To them, governments existed and expressed the will of the sovereign people. They also believed that, when governments fall in this, they no longer have the rights to the allegiance of the people.

A former President of the United States, who was a thoughtful student of American history, said, "The history of human freedom is the history of limitations on the power of government." The men who created our Constitution had suffered from Old World tyranny. To them it was a compelling necessity to sever once and for all time the shackles of the state, and after many weeks of deliberation there emerged "the greatest document ever conceived by the mind of man."

CHECKS AND BALANCES

Our country thus has a degree of local self-government not known in most of the rest of the world today. "We, the people" are guaranteed the authority to set up State, county, city, and township governments, to be rulers in our own right. This provision is our bulwark against an all-powerful, centralized Government in Washington. Our Government belongs to the people, and we must not cease to exercise the claim of ownership.

To make double sure that the Federal Government remained contained, a division of functions of Government was provided, a system of checks and balances in which the legislative, executive, and judicial departments became coordinate branches of the tree of liberty.

Each of these branches was designed to help check and balance the powers of the other branches so that no one part of Government is granted sufficient authority to take over the Government as a whole. Under our Constitution, therefore, the Government is the servant, not the master of the people. In drawing up the Constitution, its authors endeavored to make completely sure that the politicians did not get out of hand. As Thomas Jefferson expressed it: "Do not talk to me about the integrity of public officials. I say, chain the politicians to the limitations of the Constitution itself."

The practical benefits of a Government such as ours is obvious to Americans, who, with their ancestors, have lived and breathed the air of freedom for so many years. Few stop to think, however, that with the establishment of our Constitution there occurred one of the greatest miracles ever to have blessed mankind. The great new freedom created by it unloosed a tremendous drive to explore new frontiers.

"It could only happen in America" is a sentiment that has become commonplace. Men whose ancestors were limited in their ability to earn a living because of class limitations or social restrictions suddenly found that they could work at any occupation which they had the strength and ability to master. Others rose from humble positions to great wealth by virtue of their own initiative, unhampered by Old World restrictions. America was the land of opportunity. The United States was a land where a man could earn and keep for his family the fruits of his labors and call his soul his own. If all these freedoms are endangered today, and we are forced to believe they are, the fault lies not in our Constitution, but in ourselves.

There is much that patriotic Americans can do to save their country even at this late hour. We can make a good start by taking time now to consider the heritage of our Constitution and join with all patriotic Americans in a prayer of thanksgiving to Almighty God for all the blessings of our Constitution. As long as freedom's light is shining in America, freedom's hope will not die in the hearts of those who do not know liberty.

Mary Cort Schreiner, of Pennsylvania: Civic Leader and Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Mary Cort Schreiner, Mrs. Samuel A. Schreiner, of 42 St. Clair Drive, Mount Lebanon, Allegheny County, Pa., bravely faced the end of her career on August 3, 1961 at the age of 77 years. The passing of this outstanding citizen of western Pennsylvania should be noted here for future generations, because through more than half a century of active and devoted service to her Nation, church and community, Mrs. Schreiner exemplifies the best in the tradition of voluntary citizenship responsibility, and civic work that has made our great American success in self-government. I compliment Mary Schreiner on her indestructible courage, enthusiasm, and fine personality.

Since Mary Schreiner came to the rural South Hills section of Allegheny County as a bride in 1910, Mrs. Schreiner has proudly listed her occupation as homemaker. She considered it her primary task to create a happy and secure home for her husband and three children. Yet she managed to find time for active participation in a wonderful list of civic enterprises that have helped mold the face of not only her own community, but the entire greater Pittsburgh area.

Mount Lebanon, now one of the Nation's leading suburban communities, with a population of over 35,000 and an assessed valuation of \$112 million was little more than a handful of houses, scattered at the foot of a century-old country church, when the township's first organization meeting was held in the Schreiner home on February 6, 1912. In subsequent years, while her husband served as the township's attorney and solicitor, Mrs. Schreiner set about organizing the community's women for civic work and intellectual progress. The first need in those early days of few communications was a way for the women to keep up with intellectual life of the Nation. Mrs. Schreiner was one of the founders and later president of the continuing serious study group, the Women's Fortnightly Review. Later, she was active in helping to organize the present large and active, Women's Club of Mount Lebanon. This club's fine community contributions are numerous over the years. Mrs. Schreiner in her club work

was particularly active in the planting program that turned the open cornfields on which Mount Lebanon was built into today's pleasant, tree-shaded top residential area. During her tenure as president, the women's club erected the present large club building which has been a valuable community center for social, civic, and cultural activities.

Mary Schreiner's horizons and activities were not limited to her home community. During both World War I and II, she served her country as truly as any soldier in uniform. In World War I, she was chairman of food conservation and Liberty bond sales for Mount Lebanon. In World War II she took on a full-time job as volunteer executive head of the Allegheny County block plan for war services under the Office of Civilian Defense—a task which involved the recruitment, training, and direction of 10,000 women. In addition, Mrs. Schreiner was Allegheny County vice chairman of the Material Conservation Committee for which service she was cited by the Pennsylvania State Council of Defense and Gov. Edward Martin. These wartime jobs were so demanding of Mrs. Schreiner's time and energy that her husband once ruefully remarked, "I have only one wife to give for my country."

After the war, as a member of the first committee on Smoke Control of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, Mrs. Schreiner became one of those concerned citizens whose efforts have brought about a clean, pleasant city and county in the once smoky and smog-covered Pittsburgh area. Concerned as much about human interests as environmental problems she was an active member of the Allegheny County Civic Club, the Blood Bank Committee of the Red Cross, and the board of the Volunteer Bureau of the Health and Welfare Federation.

Mrs. Schreiner was obviously endowed with a great capacity for leadership. Vibrant, articulate, and tireless, she worked for her convictions and for countless civic and charitable programs. She believed that no democratic society could function without citizens who were well informed and intelligently partisan. In pursuit of the first objective, she worked with, and served as president of the Legislative Council of Western Pennsylvania. In pursuit of the latter, she was a guiding spirit and served as president and a leading member of the Mt. Lebanon Council of Republican Women.

Mary Schreiner's citizenship was, in fact, such an integral part of her personality that her pastor, the Reverend Dr. Cary N. Weisiger III felt moved to include the following statement in his message at the time of the memorial service for her at the Mount Lebanon United Presbyterian Church:

Mary Cort Schreiner had a strong conviction about civic righteousness, and, as you all know, expressed that conviction clearly. She was a member and supporter of many organizations. She was a booster of good causes. She was a patriot. She cared about her community and country. She had strong political views which were passionately held and freely expressed.

Mary Schreiner's life well serves as an inspiration and a model for the future

and for these days so critical that the President has issued a call upon all Americans for more self-sacrifice and service. By making civic duty a daily task and enthusiastic responsibility throughout all her active years, Mrs. Schreiner points the way toward keeping our Republic in order, and making civic progress a challenging, rewarding and successful enterprise for all of our citizens.

Mary Schreiner believed in civic integrity and public virtue and gave her friends and fellow citizens her sincere conviction that it is all worth while. She was a stout supporter and was on the firing line quite frequently. Her cheerful spirit and enthusiasm, her hearty willingness to work, her civic endeavor and accomplishments are a lasting legacy to our community, State, and Nation.

Suggestion for the Breast Beaters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, if the arguments of the liberal proponents of Federal aid to education were no better before President Kennedy's sweeping school-aid measure was soundly trounced than are their post mortem beatings, it is small wonder the Congress handed the Kennedy administration such a stinging defeat.

Despite these reactionary predictions of dire things ahead of our school pupils, the Congress, in voting down the Kennedy proposal, acted responsibly and followed the dictates of the majority of Americans.

There is a big job ahead for all of us, to be sure, by way of improving our public school education. It is on this that an editorial in the Washington Daily News of September 15 would have us concentrate.

The editorial, entitled "Suggestion for the Breast Beaters," follows:

SUGGESTION FOR THE BREAST BEATERS

Something to behold are the breastbeating laments of the Federal-aid-for-education advocates—as Congress prepares to go home after having driven nail after nail into the coffin of President Kennedy's broad school aid proposal.

From what is being said, one would think an unheeding Congress was condemning the Nation's children to virtual illiteracy, and that nothing whatever was being done to improve our system of public education.

"If the Monroney amendment shall be agreed to," shouted Federal-aid Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, on the Senate floor the other day, "we shall have sold the boys and girls of America and their educational system down the river."

A majority of Senator CLARK's colleagues put down this typical remark for what it was—pure demagoguery—and adopted the amendment offered by Senator MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma. This merely continued for 2 years two expiring Federal education programs—aid for areas with non-

taxpaying Federal installations and Government loans for needy students, involving about \$900 million. The Federal-aiders bitterly opposed extending these programs for 2 years because it would lessen chances of reviving the big Federal-aid proposal next year.

The point missed by the Federal-aiders, in our opinion, is that the large majority of the fathers and mothers of America feel no need for the pouring out of Federal billions for the education of their children—billions which would eventually, as certain as night and day, mean Federal control over the public school systems of America.

And all the evidence—the increasing percentages of children going to high school and college—points to the vital interest of parents in the education of these children. If these parents really felt Federal billions were needed, they would be forthcoming pronto from a responsive Congress.

Much needs to be done to improve our public schools. But much also is being done with hundreds of new school buildings being opened this fall for the first time and more hundreds under construction. A survey of 19 cities by the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers showed no teacher shortage in the areas checked, though New York had a big percentage of substandard substitutes. Other areas reported teacher surpluses.

The Federal-aid advocates, with Congress so obviously reflecting the wishes of the citizenry, should stop stewing over how to get Federal aid. They should concentrate their energies on improving the educational system and raising the necessary money at the local and State levels. They might be surprised how much they could accomplish.

New Recovery Program of Air Force Wins Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which pays deserved tribute to the new recovery program of the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

The writer of the letter is Lawrence F. Mihlon, national and industry affairs editor of Factory, a magazine published by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.

His letter presents a most encouraging report on the success of the recovery program as initiated and carried out by the Air Force Reserve.

Mr. Mihlon's letter follows:

McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.,
New York, N.Y., September 14, 1961.

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI,
House of Representatives, 423 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOWALSKI: This letter concerns a matter of considerable importance to Congress and the people, especially in light of the present international situation. It deals with the U.S. Air Force Reserve. And more specifically, the new Air Force Reserve recovery program.

I direct your attention to our meeting in Washington early this year. During our conference I expressed concern over the inefficient use of nonflying Air Force Reserve officers and airmen. I complained that in so-

called individual training units airmen were given little opportunity to develop esprit de corps and military skills. In these units reservists had no more to do but attend lectures—in subjects generally not germane to their skill classifications. As late as June of 1961, the majority of the Reserve units were of this type. At your suggestion I agreed to explore the matter further and report back. We agreed that certain action might be undertaken by the Air Force to improve this situation.

Since our meeting the Air Force has put into effect a new Reserve training program called recovery. Congress and the people of the Nation should know about this important change.

In June of 1961 I was transferred from an individual training unit into the 8308th Air Force Reserve Recovery Group, Newark, N.J. I have had the opportunity and pleasure to observe intimately the character and readiness of this unit and others like it.

I am impressed, proud, and encouraged by what I have seen. At last the Air Force reservist has a mission—a mission vital to the Nation in time of tension and conflict.

Recoverymen are the minutemen of the aerospace age. Their job is to provide auxiliary airstrips and facilities for U.S. aircraft and airmen returning from a nuclear strike. More specifically, their job is to "get them back to the battle" as soon as possible.

A recovery system will eventually be set up in every State. It will provide a network of Reserve airbases. These bases give the United States strategic striking force the "bullpen" it must have to deter aggressors and wage a winning war, if it comes.

Under the able and inspired leadership of reservists like Col. Gerald A. Garafola, commander of the 8308th and regular Air Force advisers like Lt. Col. Richard H. Furrington, the recovery program is moving ahead rapidly. Working out of available civilian airports recoverymen represent the Air Force to countless communities throughout the Nation. Since emergency is the recovery mission, a minimum of full-time equipment is purchased and maintained by each unit. Instead reservists appeal to their fellow citizens in local government and business for donations of necessary equipment on a part-time basis. This could include everything from control tower equipment to bulldozers, to firehose. In an emergency, and during certain training sessions, this equipment is pressed into service for use by the Air reservists. Civilian cooperation has been splendid—a compliment to the willingness of the American people to stand their ground against any enemy.

Summing up: With the recovery program underway there is no doubt that Air Force Reserve manpower is at last being used for its highest purpose. The Air reservist has a new and vital mission. Skills are being perfected and readiness sharpened. It is a mission vital to every American.

Yours very truly,

LAWRENCE F. MIHLON,
National and Industry Affairs Editor,
Factory.

The Harsh Facts of Life in the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, an article by Walter Lippmann appeared in the

Washington Post yesterday which I feel is of vital importance and should be brought to the attention of Congress. Mr. Lippmann has performed an invaluable service by relating the harsh facts of life in the nuclear age at a time when there are so few willing to face them:

NUCLEAR DIPLOMACY
(By Walter Lippmann)

Never before have any chiefs of state been in a situation like that in Germany today. For this is the first encounter on vital issues between great nuclear powers, and there are no historical precedents, there is no accumulated experience and wisdom, to guide them. Khrushchev and Kennedy possess what are for all practical purposes equal and absolute weapons. Khrushchev and Kennedy, Macmillan, de Gaulle, and Adenauer are working under conditions as different from World War II as flying a jet is different from running a steam locomotive. None of them has been taught how to conduct diplomacy in a nuclear age. All of them have to guess and to improvise, to experiment and to hope.

There has been a revolution in the military situation since the previous encounter over Berlin with Stalin in 1948. Then the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But beginning with the late fifties the Soviet Union with its nuclear weapons and its rockets has become an equal nuclear power. During the critical fifties Churchill and Eisenhower learned what was happening to the balance of power. Then the era of summits began. At the beginning of this era Eisenhower made the statement for which, it may well be, he will be remembered the longest. It was not sentimentality, idealism, or pacifism but the grim truth about the hydrogen bomb which caused President Eisenhower to say that there is no longer any "alternative to peace."

Modern weapons have not merely magnified and multiplied the violence of war. They have revolutionized the nature of war by introducing into it a new order of violence. Always until now, war and the threat of war, whether aggressive or defensive, were usable instruments for the national purpose. They were usable because wars could still be won or lost. In the prenuclear wars the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. The damage, though great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union. But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean a hundred million dead, the devastation of the great urban centers, and the contamination of the Earth, the water, and the air, there would be no such recovery. The damage done would be mutual, there would be no victor, and for all practical purposes the ruin would be irreparable.

American nuclear power can reduce Soviet society to smoldering ruins and leave the wretched survivors shocked, starving, and diseased. The Soviet Union can, it is coolly estimated, kill between 30 and 70 million Americans. Such a war would not be followed by reconstruction. It would be followed by a savage struggle for existence as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

It used to be said of the British naval commander in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the war in an afternoon. Khrushchev and Kennedy can do that now. In a few hours Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the achievements and the promises of the Communist economy; Kennedy can lose the Constitution and the free enterprise system and

the American way of life, and along with them all the frontiers, old, and new. I do not think that this is overstated. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred since man appeared on this planet. In saying this my object is not to add to the general creepiness. But we cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter unless we remind ourselves that nuclear war is not just another war as history describes wars, but a wholly new order of violence.

Because the destructiveness of the new armaments is equal and virtually absolute neither of the two chiefs of Government can threaten the other with such a war. As long as each has kept his own armory of weapons in order, neither can or need believe the nuclear threats of the other. If, for example, Khrushchev has resumed testing, not for technical military reasons but for terrorization, he will not and cannot terrorize President Kennedy. For this testing cannot remove the awful retaliatory power of the U.S. nuclear weapon systems.

In cold blood no government can, no government will, start a nuclear war with an equal nuclear power. Only a moral idiot would press the button. The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea what they are talking about. They have not been able to imagine and realize what a nuclear war would be like. But the governments know quite well what a nuclear war would be like. That is why there is bluff at the core of any threat to initiate a nuclear exchange. There is also a wishful belief that the bluff will work because it will not be called.

Nevertheless, though a nuclear war would be lunacy and is unlikely, it is an ever-present possibility. Why? Because however irrational it may be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to a point where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings.

This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. It is as much a reality as a megaton bomb, and in the nuclear age it must be given weighty consideration in the calculation of policy. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which the reactions are uncontrollable. The governments must know where that line is and they must stay well back of it. Here lies the greatest danger of miscalculation, and therefore of war.

Both sides, we had better realize, are capable of miscalculating where that line is. Khrushchev, who has no sufficient experience of a state whose speech is free, is prone to think that Kennedy can and should control an explosion of popular feeling. The fact is that there is a limit to President Kennedy's ability to lead public opinion, and he is in sight of that limit. Mr. Khrushchev must make no mistake about this.

For our part, we are prone to suppose that because speech is strictly regimented in the Soviet Union, that there is no irresistible internal pressures on Khrushchev. This can be a very dangerous illusion.

In both countries there is a line which it is not safe for the other to cross. It is the line where compromise will be regarded as humiliation and surrender. This line will have to be made precise in the negotiations. Blockade of the access routes is such a line for this country. For the Soviet Union such a line would be the giving of nuclear arms to West Germany. These are lines of provocation which cannot be crossed without provoking uncontrollable, indeed suicidal, reactions.

This being the nuclear age it is the paramount rule of international politics that a great nuclear power must not put another great nuclear power in a position where it

must choose between suicide and surrender. And the corollary of this rule is that no great nuclear power must put itself in a position where it has made such absolute and such rigid stipulations that it can no longer negotiate an honorable and tolerable accommodation.

South Georgia Beach Resorts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of the session, there have recently been numerous calls to my office from my colleagues and their staff members asking about the fabulous beach resorts in south Georgia, more specifically in the Eighth District which I am proud to represent in the Congress. I refer to St. Simons Island, Sea Island, and the new Jekyll, Georgia's year-round beach resorts. Under leave to extend my remarks, to answer these several requests I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress, as well as the Nation, some descriptive information about these historic areas.

ST. SIMONS ISLAND

With its woodland drives, St. Simons, near Brunswick, Ga., arched by massive live oaks fringed with Spanish moss is unequaled in America in quiet beauty, historical memories, legends and dramatic events. It is truly an Eden, with its mild climate, wide white beaches, flowers and sunshine.

Visitors to St. Simons may enjoy various kinds of recreation—golf, tennis, bowling, shuffleboard, pool or surf bathing, aquaplaning, boating, horseback riding, skeet shooting and dancing.

Some of the finest year-round fishing in the South is found in the salt rivers and creeks around the island. In the sounds and offshore, larger fish, sea bass, drum, trout, sheephead, blue fish, bonita and tarpon provide excellent sport fishing.

Fort Frederica, a national park, where General Oglethorpe and the early Georgians turned back the Spanish in the Battle of Bloody Marsh, is one of the most historically interesting places in the United States and is well worth anyone's time for inspection.

SEA ISLAND

Further up the beach from St. Simons is Sea Island with its beautiful Cloister Hotel which was owned by the late Howard E. Coffin, promoter of this seacoast resort. Architectural cue for the hotel follows the island's Spanish background. You will need reservations in advance as Sea Island is considered one of the finest resorts in the land. Created for those who expect the ultimate in gracious living, Sea Island is a resort of distinction.

JEKYLL ISLAND

Advertised as the pride of the Empire State of the South, Jekyll Island, off the coast of Brunswick, was once the private

playground of a hundred of the Nation's millionaires. Because of its beauty and mild climate, Jekyll Island was purchased by the millionaires from the descendants of the Du Bignon family who had owned it from colonial times. It became nationally known as the Jekyll Island Club.

Purchased by the State of Georgia in 1947 and now managed by the Jekyll Island State Park Authority, Jekyll is the perfect place for a full vacation, a long weekend or that family day outing. After picnicking in the shady, breeze swept nook with breathtaking beauty at your elbow, you may rest, relax and return home with new peace of mind, and new pep in your step.

Jekyll's 9 miles of snow-white beaches flanked by ancient oaks and stately palms are unparalleled in beauty. Jekyll is proud of its golf course, built for and by men who knew and played the best. For conventions and meetings, a spacious 850 seat air-conditioned combined auditorium and aquarama has been recently completed. Museums, a sun drenched surf, picnic grounds, the best fishing grounds, historical sites, hotels, motels and restaurants, you'll find everything at the vacation resorts in the Eighth District.

Come by car, by train, by plane or by boat—but definitely you want to come. There is plenty of warm weather remaining down in the friendly south, and these Golden Isles of Georgia just off the coast of Brunswick provide everything for your enjoyment at reasonable, moderate, and the ultimate in expenditure.

Pattern for a Red Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Is the present U.N. armed intervention in Katanga setting a pattern for a Red Africa? That is a question very many Americans are asking these days as they contemplate the news reports of carnage, violence and political chicanery in the Congo.

On what logical basis do armed, aggressive U.N. forces intervene in behalf of possible pro-Soviet, pro-Communist, anti-American and anti-free world leadership in Katanga to replace a leadership which, whatever its merits or demerits, is lined up solidly on the side of free enterprise, democratic principles, anticommunism and warm friendship toward the West.

The money of this Nation and the American people is being used to finance reportedly about one-half of the total cost of the current U.N. military operations in Katanga. Thus, American money is being used to oust our friends and install our potential enemies in positions of leadership in Katanga.

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that there should be deep concern in this country about this aggressive, violent program, the most likely net result of which, may well be to put radical, pro-Communist, anti-American leaders in control of the rich, productive state of Katanga. Is there no other way, a way short of putting pro-Communists in power by which the U.N. can establish order and peace in the Congo.

How soon will this pattern spread or be applied to other African States? Is it not very likely that this policy will ultimately turn all Africa Red? Do we remember China and the harmless agrarian reformers?

I think it is high time for our State Department and our U.N. delegation reappraised the entire African situation in the light of these ominous developments in the Congo. Speed and prompt, effective action is imperative to offset the Red Anschluss in Africa.

Is It a Question of Pure Milk or Not-So-Pure Monopolies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's firm and forthright endorsement of milk sanitation legislation which would make the U.S. Public Health Service's milk code the quality yardstick for milk moving in interstate trade, has brought squeals of protests from the sections of the country which are now misusing their health regulations as trade barriers to protect their local milk monopolies. New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has taken a stand against consumers, including those in his own State, and against the bulk of dairy farmers in order to defend the milk regulations of his State, which are so written to insure that New York dairymen will have a virtual monopoly on the New York milk market.

As my good friend and neighbor from Minnesota, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, pointed out in a speech in the Senate, the New York Governor is "a protectionist at home, but a free trader abroad," a man less concerned about imports of Japanese textiles than of milk from Wisconsin. Senator HUMPHREY is leading the fight for enactment of national milk sanitation legislation in the Senate, with the able support of his Minnesota colleague, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, and Wisconsin's Senators WILLIAM PROXMIER and ALEXANDER WILEY.

When testifying in favor of my national milk sanitation bill in hearings held before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, both Secretary Freeman and Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, cited the results of a study

made by the U.S. Public Health Service at the request of House Health and Safety Subcommittee of the differences between the Public Health Service milk code and the regulations of States which have adopted other types of milk standards. This study revealed that the majority of the 14 States with regulations differing from the code have sets of standards which are far less stringent and less thorough than the code of many fundamental sanitation requirements applicable both to dairy farms and pasteurization plants and to inspection and laboratory procedures.

A detailed comparison of the code with the milk sanitation regulations of New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania revealed many instances where the sanitary standards of those States are less specific and less stringent than the code. This information is particularly interesting in light of the fact that all four of these States refuse to accept out-of-State milk unless it is inspected by their own inspectors to see that it meets State milk sanitation standards.

The Eastern and Southern States which are opposing national milk sanitation legislation always claim they are doing so to protect their consumers against impure milk. However, this argument does not hold water when you consider the fact that the milk regulations of these States are not as good as those provided in the U.S. Public Health Service milk code, which, under the provisions of the national milk sanitation legislation, would be the quality yardstick for milk moving from State to State.

This entire controversy is summarized in an excellent editorial published in the September 13, 1961, Dairy Record. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that editorial in the RECORD:

FREEMAN'S SUPPORT OF SANITATION BILL STIRS MAJOR CONTROVERSY

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman stirred up a hornet's nest in his testimony for the National Milk Sanitation Act (Dairy Review, Sept. 6). The controversy was barely started before politics entered the issue.

In his testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in which he strongly supported the legislation, Secretary Freeman singled out 14 States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Tennessee, North Dakota, and California—on which the U.S. Public Health Service had made a comparison of State milk standards as compared with the USPH model sanitation code. His testimony pointed out places where the State standards allegedly were inferior to the USPH code.

His statements brought an immediate reaction from officials in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, plus attacks by Members of Congress, and a stout defense by proponents of the milk sanitation act in the Senate.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER ATTACKS FREEMAN

New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller charged the Secretary with "pushing (milk) legislation favoring his home State of Minnesota and its immediate neighbors at the expense of the rest of the country."

The Republican Governor said the proposed milk sanitation law supported by Secretary Freeman would "open the milk markets of New York's dairymen to a periodic flood of surplus milk from the upper mid-west." Such a development, he added, would mean "disastrous results for our dairymen."

Democratic Senators from Minnesota and Wisconsin unloaded on the Governor the following day. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, in a Senate speech called the New York Governor "a protectionist at home, but a free trader abroad," a man less concerned about imports of Japanese textiles than of milk from Wisconsin. Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat of Minnesota, said Governor Rockefeller's position was against the interests of dairy farmers in the Midwest and consumers in New York and other eastern States—a "horse and buggy" attitude. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER, Democrat of Wisconsin, told the Senate that Governor Rockefeller, a likely candidate for the Republican presidential nomination in 1964, had thrown away any chance he might have to win the Wisconsin primary.

The next day, Republican Senators KENNETH B. KEATING and JACOB K. JAVITS, both of New York, rushed to Rockefeller's aid. Senator KEATING said Senator HUMPHREY apparently did not care about the health of New Yorkers and said that "now that the presidential campaign is over, he is exclusively Minnesota-bound."

DENIES OHIO REGULATIONS LAX

Raymond K. Davis, chief of the Ohio division of food and dairies, denied that Ohio's milk regulations are lax. He said there has not been "the first documented incident of anyone being ill from drinking Ohio milk."

"Perhaps the folks in Washington are not aware we have two agencies which regulate the milk industry in this State—State laws and those set up by county and city health departments," he said. The USPH report submitted by Secretary Freeman said that Ohio's milk regulations were too "broadly written" and that they "lack specificity with respect to important items."

William L. Henning, Pennsylvania secretary of agriculture, likewise issued a statement denying that his State's milk regulations allow production of inferior milk. He added that it is absurd to think that a few men operating under the U.S. Public Health Service code could do the job in Pennsylvania which now requires about 500 men.

Establish a U.S. Arm Control Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider the bill to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. I am confident that the majority of my colleagues in the House will approve the establishment of this important Agency. In recent weeks the majority of our free American press has overwhelmingly endorsed the idea. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include herewith two editorials—one from the Baltimore Evening Sun of September 2, and one from the Sunday Sun of September 10, which I believe fairly and dispassionately bring the problem into

proper perspective. It is my feeling that these views should be called to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 2, 1961]

PERSISTENT FAITH

Russia, with a calculated swiftness, has followed up its revocation of the moratorium on nuclear weapons tests with the explosion of a "nuclear device" in "the atmosphere." This has given rise to a new surge of alarm among the neutralist countries and widespread political and technical speculation. Is Premier Khrushchev committing himself to the tactics of terrorization? Was the "device" something new, or perhaps a component of a superbomb, or possibly some kind of superior warhead for its ballistic missiles? Moscow has announced that combined fleet and rocket military exercises will be held later this month, presumably with the emphasis on the rockets.

In such a context it is easy to regard any concern with disarmament as the idlest of futile exercises in irrelevancy. Yet the administration, which is certainly not neglecting our defensive power, is pushing to get its proposals for a permanent coordinated U.S. disarmament agency before the Senate. President Kennedy is reported ready to name Arthur H. Dean a negotiator, if another disarmament conference is held. And, in fact, John J. McCloy, the President's chief adviser on disarmament, will renew his preliminary conversations with the Russians on Wednesday. Is all this wasted time and effort? Not at all.

To repeat what the Evening Sun said not long ago, where great projects are at stake it is the responsibility of statesmanship to look beyond immediate events to permanent goals. There have been times in the past when American policy's chief fault was too great preoccupation with today's needs to the exclusion of tomorrow's. All that is happening now underlines the pressing fact that, whatever comes, mankind at some point in its history will have to learn to control, if not abolish, its instruments of destruction. That may be far in the future but the administration is wholly right to try to prepare for it, and deserves sympathy and support in doing so.

Moreover, there is an immediate purpose to be served as well. The response of the non-aligned countries at the Belgrade meeting to what Russia is doing suggests how eagerly they would welcome all actions expressing confidence in an ultimate limitation of arms. The continuing interest of the United States in striving to achieve that end contrasts sharply with the Soviet's recent actions. And whatever Premier Khrushchev may think, opinion in the long run is a decisive element in the shaping of world affairs. Men will not fail to remark that even in this time of crisis the United States is not abandoning long-range disarmament planning, nor will men fail to draw comfort from our persistence in that endeavor.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 10, 1961]

ARMS CONTROL AGENCY

In a narrow sense it may be called ironical that Senate approval of a permanent U.S. arms-control agency should coincide with the Soviet Union's rejection of a ban on nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Never has effective arms control seemed more remote than at this moment. The merest mention of the subject sounds, if narrowly taken, like unrealistic dreaming.

If we were to assume that the present course of events will lead straight and inevitably to the disaster of a great war, then indeed to plan for arms control would be idle. But that is an assumption of despair. It is an assumption no responsible government can make. A responsible government must gird itself for threats to the national secu-

rity as they arise, and at the same time continue to look beyond each crisis to the future.

The Senate has seen this, and has voted overwhelming approval (73 for and 14 against, with Senators BEALL and BUTLER commendably among the majority) of a bill to set up an agency for research and planning in techniques of arms control that might promise reductions in war-making potential, while protecting the security of nations.

The Senate understands that the agency if created could perform nothing in the faintest way miraculous. But at the same time its Members in majority reject arguments that to move the measure ahead at this time would indicate national weakness, and suggestions that the whole proposal is a mere move in a popularity contest for world opinion.

As to the first, if we are that frail we are lost—and we are not lost. As to the second, this is a deeply considered approach, far from the token gestures in the days when the hapless Harold Stassen was given disarmament as a sop; and President Eisenhower himself before he left office recognized genuine planning for arms control as a governmental duty. Advocates of the present proposal included such toughminded men as Thomas S. Gates, Jr., a Defense Secretary under Mr. Eisenhower, John J. McCloy, and General Lemnitzer.

The proper designation in arms control, Senator CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, performed a service in getting that phrase inserted in the title of the agency. It is now called the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security: a cumbersome title, but useful in emphasizing our concept of a safe gradual system of control leading toward disarmament, and in making it plain that this is distinctly not a gesture toward Mr. Khrushchev's notion of a quick, unpoliced, and mortally dangerous general disarmament.

The Senate has done well. It is now up to the House, in committee and on the floor, to act with matching soberness and responsibility.

National Observance of 175th Anniversary of Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a statement I made before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee, in behalf of House Joint Resolution 475, introduced by me in July, to amend the joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States:

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. BYRNE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4, JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of Subcommittee No. 4, in early July of this year it was my privilege and honor to introduce House Joint Resolution 475 to amend the joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

There is little need and even less time for me, now, to dwell upon the importance of a celebration such as has been proposed and adopted by the Congress. The current Congress received, in June, the report of a duly appointed commission created to recommend plans and an adequate program to assure a proper and fitting celebration of the Constitution. The work of the commission, under the terms of the joint resolution of July 14, 1960, was to expire with the appointment of a permanent commission instructed to carry out or execute complete arrangements under terms of enabling legislation to be enacted by this present Congress. Such legislation, it was recommended, should provide for an appropriation of at least \$500,000. That, in essence, is the matter to be discussed in detail by this subcommittee.

The plans recommended by the initiatory commission are quite comprehensive. Basically, the work of a permanent commission to execute the proposed plans must be in the area of public relations. Sound, sensible, consistent, and persistent publicity disseminated in every type of communications media must be pursued.

There can be no doubt, even in ordinary times, of the need for and value of such a celebration as has been proposed. But we are living today in extraordinary times. It is no exaggeration to say that in this perilous hour the very preservation of our Union is at stake. It is threatened not merely by forces beyond our national lines, but, indeed, even by insidious dangers lurking within the confines of our national boundaries. And it is this latter evil which must be recognized and corrected.

I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, of what appears to be a widespread apathy on the part of our citizens. Far too many of our numbers seem to have the attitude that "nothing can happen to us." Far too many are indifferent to the widening perils that are closing in upon us. These fears which I voice are not mere figments of an overworked imagination. They are very real. It is imperative that we, Members of this Congress, take the initiative in changing this very serious threat and I can think of no more effective course than getting our people back to a study and a love for that precious document that is the guardian and guarantor of our precious liberties—the Constitution of the United States.

While I hesitate to belabor the issue or to encroach too greatly on the valuable time of the members of this subcommittee, I feel that I cannot emphasize too much the need to alert the people to the beauty of the great document we plan to honor. The people of the Nation should be encouraged to get reacquainted with the basic law of the land. It would help them to understand the purpose and the meaning of this great national charter that is the best guarantee of our security, and the welfare of the Nation.

America is passing through perhaps the most trying period in our history as a nation. It is imperative that our people be awakened to the very real dangers that confront the Nation and to recall to the public mind the endless "blood, sweat, and tears" that have gone into the fabrication, the molding, and creation of this great country. We dare not, as a people, become indifferent to the lessons and the safeguards found in the Constitution.

America must awaken, without delay. Americans must shed any tendency to the lethargy which has been manifest all too often in recent years.

In the last quarter of a century we have gone through a second World War, warfare in Korea, and a seemingly unending cold war that has persisted since 1945; man has emerged into an age of scientific wonders that finds mankind literally reaching for the stars; our population has increased by nearly

50 million persons, and we have thrived materially beyond all previous hopes and dreams.

But, meanwhile, we have been living alongside a Godless, communistic dictatorship, a devouring political ogre, holding virtually half the world in slavery, challenging our bright hopes of a world of peace and justice in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. Now, more than ever before, we need to renew our birthright at the well-springs of faith and patriotism; we need to renew that spirit of old which moved the founding fathers to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Let us, indeed, get back to the constitution and there find the sustenance that will move us to present our example as a free people for all the world to behold—and follow. The constitution is a wonderful document and the story of its formation and adoption is equally marvelous and delightful.

Mr. Chairman, let us not miss this opportunity to bring the message of the Constitution to the very hearts of our people and thus assure our continuance as one nation united under God for the good of all mankind. Now is the time to kindle patriotic fervor in our people.

Perhaps I have been somewhat verbose in my plea to have you pass favorably on this joint resolution before you, but, like every Member of this Congress, and countless millions of our people, I feel most strongly about the constitution of the United States and I do look with some real concern for the future of our grand country.

Much of this fear may be dissipated by the action this body takes upon this resolution today. I earnestly request that you recommend that a permanent commission to direct this celebration be created and given the sum of \$500,000 to carry out the program as planned.

Steuben Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoon, September 30, 1961, the fourth annual Steuben Parade will be held in the city of New York. This parade is sponsored by the German-American Committee of Greater New York and is an outstanding event. It honors Major General von Steuben who played such an important part in the Revolutionary War as a member of the staff of Gen. George Washington. This year's parade will have about 50 floats and more than 50 bands will be in the line of march, which will also include delegations from 8 large German cities, and German-American groups from all parts of the United States.

One of the groups coming to the United States to participate in the Steuben Parade is the Dusseldorf Fanfarenkörps. The Dusseldorf Fanfarenkörps has an interesting history which I would like to review here.

This magnificent ancient drum and trumpet corps traces its ancestry back to medieval times. Musically, the use of trumpets and kettledrums was reserved for the nobility and it is safe to assume that when Dusseldorf was elevated to the

rank of a town by Count Adolf of Berg in 1288 the trumpets and drums heralded this significant step forward. The town of Dusseldorf suffered severely in the Thirty Years' War and in the War of Spanish Succession, but recovered its prosperity under the patronage of Elector John William of the Palatinate, a true patron of the arts, who dwelt in his castle, the Schloss Benrath, until his death in 1716.

Music in Dusseldorf was encouraged during the Middle Ages. The Turnertower men—sounded their horns at specific intervals during the day. It is also interesting to note that it was considered a great honor by the trumpeters and kettledrummers of Dusseldorf to be accepted by the Royal Trumpeters & Kettledrummers Guild, with the Elector of Saxony as its hereditary patron. Members of this guild did not receive their diplomas until they had passed their required tests after a minimum of 4 years training.

The continuity of the existence of the trumpeters and drums of Dusseldorf was broken by the severity of World War II. However, with the emergence of the new Dusseldorf which, due to its strategic location on the Rhine—situated between the Ruhr coal and steel area and the new Federal capital of Bonn—has become the industrial and banking center of Western Germany, interest was once again centered on the proud history of its Fanfarenkörps. In 1953, the streets of Dusseldorf once more resounded to the ancient music of medieval times. Attired in authentic costumes of the Middle Ages, 22 young men of the city of Dusseldorf, proficient in the art of drumming and trumpeting, reinstated their Fanfarenkörps. This rebirth occurred in 1953. Since that time, this Fanfarenkörps has made history with its authentic medieval music. It has traveled throughout Europe demonstrating this ancient and royal art with great success.

We, in New York City, are most happy to welcome this group to the United States, and I am sure that the people of the entire United States join this welcome. My congressional district is being honored by having the Dusseldorf Fanfarenkörps participate in the concert being given by the Seuffert Band, George Seuffert, conductor, at Forest Park, Queens County, N.Y., on Sunday afternoon, October 1, 1961.

Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following platform adopted by the Affiliated Young